DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 207 PS 010 387

TITLE	Families and Family-Institution Transactions in Child Development: An Analysis of the Family Research Program of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth, and Families. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	George Peabody Coll. for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn. Center for Community Studies.; Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn. Center for the Study of Families and Children.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 Apr 78
CONTRACT	105-77-1045
NOTE	119p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development; *Child Rearing; *Family (Sociological Unit); *Family Programs; Family Relationship; Intervention; *Program Development; Research Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*Recommendations

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to help advance the family research program of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) by (1) surveying and analyzing selected literature and recent research on the family and (2) drawing implications for future research program development. Chapter I attempts to conceptualize the historical antecedents of the modern family by reviewing the history of research efforts in this area. Chapter 2 describes the methods used to obtain the relevant universe of family research studies for this report. Findings and conclusions drawn from the research are presented in Chapter 3. The studies examined are grouped into three major categories: child rearing and intrafamilial relationships; intervention into individual and family development; and family-institution relationships. Each group of studies is discussed in terms of: history of research; ACYF research relative to that of other agencies; what is known and with what degree of confidence; promising hypotheses and program implications. The final chapter contains recommendations for future efforts in the area of research on children, youth and families. These recommendations fall into three categories: (1) conceptual and theoretical foundations, (2) research and program development, and (3) methodological and technical assistance. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167247

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FAMILIES AND FAMILY-INSTITUTION TRANSACTIONS IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT

An Analysis of the Family Research Program of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth, and Families

Contract #105-77-1045

FINAL REPORT

Center for Community Studies
George Peabody College for Teachers

and

Center for the Study of Families and Children
Institute for Public Policy Studies
Vanderbilt University

J. R. Newbrough, Project Director
Paul R. Dokecki, Senior Researcher
Kathleen H. Dunlop, Senior Researcher
James H. Hogge, Statistical Specialist
Celeste G. Simpkins, Project Coordinator

with the assistance of

Louise Barnes, Barry Boggs, Sharon
Innes, Jean Percy, and Sally Robinson

April 1, 1978

Nashville, Tennessee

PS010387

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the interest and support of the many persons who contributed to this project. That such a large task was completed in such a small amount of time is testimony to the generous help.

Project Officer Aeolian Jackson and Director of Research Development and Evaluation Edith Grotberg of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) were helpful in providing materials, meeting with us periodically to review our work, and giving direction and encouragement on this task.

Maure Hurt and his Social Research Group at George Washington University oriented us to their computer-based information system and shared with us their previous work for ACYF.

Joan Aldous, Barbara Anderson, Urie Bronfenbrenner, John Dill, Greta Fein, Reuben Hill, Jerome Kagan, and Evelyn Moore served as members of a panel of experts and were generous with their time. A much needed supplement to our work was provided through their efforts.

Nicholas Hobbs and the staff at Vanderbilt's Center for the Study of Families and Children provided a useful forum for discussion of our emerging ideas.

Evylin Herrell, Frances Garner, Lee Pettyjohn, Tim Evans, and Dan Rickard, all of Peabody's Center for Community Studies, were helpful in readying the report for production. Barbara Woodall typed the original manuscript and Evylin Herrell the final copy, in expert fashion. Peabody's Central Services was quick and efficient in duplicating it despite a very heavy work schedule.

To everyone our very sincere thanks.

J. R. Newbrough, for the Project Staff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . iii

CONTENTS . . . v

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . vii

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND . . . 1
  Historical Perspectives on Families and Family Research . . . 2
    The History of the Family . . . 2
    The History of Family Research . . . 8

Chapter 2: METHOD . . . 15
  The Universe of Studies . . . 15
  Procedures for Review and Analysis . . . 17

Chapter 3: RESULTS . . . 19
  Child-Rearing and Intrafamily Relationships . . . 19
    History of Research . . . 19
    ACYF Research Relative to That of Other Agencies . . . 22
    What Is Known and With What Degree of Confidence? . . . 22
    Promising Hypotheses and Program Implications . . . 36
  Intervention Into Individual and Family Development . . . 38
    History of Research . . . 38
    ACYF Research Relative to That of Other Agencies . . . 40
    What Is Known and With What Degree of Confidence? . . . 40
    Promising Hypotheses and Program Implications . . . 53
  Family-Institution Relationships . . . 55
    History of Research . . . 55
    ACYF Research Relative to That of Other Agencies . . . 57
    What is Known and With What Degree of Confidence? . . . 57
    Promising Hypotheses and Program Implications . . . 69

Chapter 4: RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 72
  Theoretical Issues That Researchers Should Address Explicitly in Proposing Ecologically Oriented Research on Children, Youth, and Families . . . 72
    Family Development . . . 72
    Intrafamily Systems Relative to Transaction Systems . . . 73
    Life Stress . . . 73
    Mediating Structures or Support Systems . . . 75
    Liaison or Linkage . . . 75
    Pluralism in American Life . . . 76
  Recommendations for Research and Program Development . . . 76
    Recommended Research Questions for Family Development and Child-Rearing . . . 76

Recommended Research Directions and Questions for Intervention 77
Recommended Research Questions for Family-Institution Relationships 78
Recommendations for Methodology and Technical Assistance . . . 78
Recommendations for Methodological Aspects of All Projects. 78
Recommendations for Technical Assistance. 79
Conclusion 79

REFERENCES. 80

APPENDICES. 89
Appendix A: ACYF-Funded Projects Selected for this Study. . . 89
Appendix B: Selected Reports from the Educational Testing Service Longitudinal Study on Head Start 99
Appendix C: Panel of Experts and Nominated Studies. 101
Appendix D: Description of Review Manual. 107

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to help advance the family research program of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) by (a) surveying and analyzing selected literature and recent research on the family and (b) drawing implications for future research and program development.

An overview of historians' recent studies of American families is presented in Chapter 1. This review of historical studies led to the conclusion that, although social forces have altered traditional family structures and functions, we must not draw the romantic conclusion that the good old days should be restored. Efforts to understand the impact of family social forces and processes on child development are priorities for both privately and governmentally-sponsored research. ACYF's family research program has posed questions that are relatively new for behavioral and social science researchers. Neither traditional approaches to child development research nor traditional family sociological studies have dealt adequately with the concerns raised by ACYF's research program; ACYF interest in the influence of family-institution transactions on child development is a new and important area.

The methods used in preparation of this report are presented in Chapter 2. Family research from the following sources was reviewed and analyzed: (a) all studies funded since 1974 by ACYF's family research program; (b) an ACYF-funded longitudinal study conducted by the Educational Testing Service; (c) an ACYF-funded national collaborative study of the persistence of preschool effects; (d) selected ACYF-funded research and demonstration programs; (e) exemplary studies nominated by a panel of experts chosen for our study; and (f) selected studies funded by other federal agencies. The projects were reviewed in terms of internal validity, external validity, and promise for future research and program development.

The findings and conclusions drawn from the research are presented in Chapter 3. Three major categories of studies were examined: childrearing and intrafamilial relationships; intervention into individual and family development; and family-institution relationships. In each section, the research area was placed in historical context; ACYF research was related to that of other federal agencies; the findings were catalogued and subjected to methodological scrutiny; and promising hypotheses and program implications were derived.

Topics of interest in the area of child-rearing and intrafamilial relationships were: family status and family process variables; individual resources and constitutional factors in development; parental expectations and change in expectations and attitudes over time; and parents' relations with extrafamilial institutions.

In the area of intervention into individual and family development, the topics of interest included: longitudinal assessment of the effects of early childhood intervention; approaches designed to support family strengths; and exploration of intervention-related factors in the natural ecology of family and child development.

Studies of family-institution relationships fell into one of three categories: one-way effect studies of families' perceptions and attitudes toward institutions, or analyses of institutional policies, practices, and procedures; two-way effect studies of interactions of parents and professionals; and linkage studies of transactions between primary groups (mediating structures) and bureaucratic operatives.

The final chapter contains recommendations for future efforts in the area of research on children, youth, and families. These recommendations, which are summarized below, fall into three categories: (1) conceptual and theoretical foundations, (2) research and program development, and (3) methodology and technical assistance.

The ACYF family research agenda requires the development of theoretical approaches and concepts capable of dealing with the social ecology of families. Among approaches surveyed, the family development concept lends itself to understanding the movement of diverse American families through their life cycles. The relationship of these cycles to the development of children and youth must be recognized, conceptualized, and researched. A theoretical understanding of the complexity of the interactions among family members and their transactions with the larger environment as they relate to child development must also be established. An approach based on stress theory may provide an understanding of the relationship between (a) stressful events or situations, (b) coping and adaptation, and (c) development of children, youth, and families. The concept of mediating structures or support systems may be important in understanding the role of primary support groups (families, kinship networks, neighborhoods, churches, volunteer organizations, and other primary support groups) as mediators between the demands of American bureaucratic structures (e.g., health, education, welfare) and parents, children, and youth. A related concept is that of liaison, which focuses on linkages (shared plans of action) that must be established (a) between families with needs and available community resources and (b) among families, mediating structures, and bureaucratic structures. Finally, there is a need to recognize and conceptualize pluralism in American life. Diversity among American family forms and functions, which is both desirable and necessary, must be respected, enhanced, and further understood, while the common goals of the larger society are both preserved and furthered.

As part of a family research program, many factors related to environmental impacts on children's development should be studied. Investigations should be based on theoretical approaches encompassing systems, ecological, and transactional perspectives. In the area of intervention narrow conceptualizations must be replaced by comprehensive strategies that support both family strengths and mediating structures. Intervention should not be limited to the early years, but should extend into continuing aspects of development. A transactional perspective on family-institution interactions should be developed further to include a broad range of family types, ethnic groups, and socioeconomic backgrounds as well as a wide range of institutional sizes, types, and functions.

A program of technical assistance should be provided for all projects, and particularly for new, promising entrants into the field of family research and demonstration. Assistance should ensure that theoretical and conceptual foundations are clearly developed, that designs allow for testing of stated hypotheses, that instrumentation is appropriate to the variables to be measured, and that analyses make maximal use of the data.

This report represents the judgment of the authors in the form of analyses, observations, and questions. Recommendations are offered to ACYF and to the field as specific suggestions for action. As such they can be debated and revised during the course of policymaking. We hope that they will be effective stimulants for action to improve ACYF's very important commitment to family research.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report was prepared to help advance the family research program of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) by (a) surveying and analyzing the knowledge base in family research and (b) drawing implications from those data for future research and program development. The focus is on ACYF-funded projects. Research studies funded by other federal agencies or reported in the published literature were used selectively to interpret ACYF project findings and to address particular issues.

In approaching this project, we at Peabody's Center for Community Studies and Vanderbilt's Center for the Study of Families and Children profess three theoretical preferences--notions that are consistent with much of the current thinking of ACYF but contrary to the prevailing research traditions of the 1960s.

The first of these preferences is the use of an ecological perspective, wherein human development concerns are viewed as going beyond the emphasis of the sixties on individual children or families to the consideration of conditions in personal, social, economic, and political domains. We speak of the ecology of human development.

Second, whereas children were the focus of research in the 1960s, the role of families in child development is now being emphasized. We speak of families as society's primary human development systems.

Third, the prevailing approach to human development intervention in the 1960s was deficit oriented, stressing problems of exceptional children and families. We prefer the proposition that all American families face serial and developmental stresses and crises requiring both intrafamilial resources and extrafamilial supports to facilitate coping and adaptation. Although certain families (e.g., low-income, single-parent, minority, and those having handicapped children) may be actuarially more vulnerable than others to social and developmental stresses, we believe there is a range of family styles, with different patterns of handling stress, rather than an easily demonstrable, qualitative dichotomy between so-called normal and pathological families.

In light of our conceptual preferences, we believe that a framework is needed to identify universal variables at six levels: (a) child, (b) family's effect on the child, (c) family as a system, (d) family-institutional transaction, (e) institution, and (f) public policy. We believe further that it is imperative to determine the interrelationships of these variables relative to their theoretical and predictive utility for understanding human development. This report works toward initial development of such a framework.

We add an important caveat concerning our third theoretical preference--a range of family styles vis-à-vis coping with stress. We have elected to emphasize typical matters facing most American families. In the early 1970s, most professionals began to see that many of the intervention approaches designed for poor and disadvantaged children were appropriate for other children as well. In a related spirit, we emphasize the similarities rather than the differences among American families in the tasks and stresses they face and the resources they require. As suggested above, differences are interpreted as matters of degree and not kind

Historical Perspectives on Families and Family Research

Since 1965 there has been a veritable explosion of family research activity. In examining four recent extensive bibliographies of research on marriage and the family (Aldous & Dahl, 1974; Aldous & Hill, 1967; Olson & Dahl, 1975, 1977), we found that almost 26,000 studies have been published in English between 1900 and 1976, more than half of them since 1965. Over this same period there has also been an explosion of activity in the behavioral and social sciences in general. Christopher Lasch (1977), in his recent historical treatise on American families, argued that both research explosions are related to the same emerging political, economic, and social factors. Further, Lasch suggested that the history of the family and the history of family research have been related closely over the last hundred years. It is in the spirit of Lasch's theses that we present in this section brief overviews of (a) Attempts by historians to conceptualize the historical antecedents of the modern family and (b) the history of research efforts in this area by behavioral and social scientists. In both cases, the overviews are presented relative to the concerns of ACYF's family research program.

The History of the Family

"The history of the family, once the province of amateurs and antiquarians, has become an academic industry" (Lasch, 1975, p. 33), a scholarly endeavor that may help provide the missing link "between the study of culture and the study of social structure, production, and power" (p. 33).

The expanding family history field contains many controversies. For example, representing one pole, Edward Shorter (1977) argued that a number of important changes in the emotional life (*la vie intime*) of Western families has taken place since the sixteenth century, changes involving (a) a move away from ties with community, kin, and lineage toward privacy and individualism, and (b) a move from concern for property to a concern for sentiment, and, ultimately, toward a preoccupation with sex. For Shorter, capitalism produced the preferences for privacy and sentiment, while an unknown set of forces in the 1960s and 1970s is producing exacerbated preferences for individualism and sex. The result is the crumbling of the family characterized by

> the definitive cutting of the lines leading from younger generation to older--an adolescent indifference to the family's identity, to what it stands for that shows up in the discontinuity of values from parents to children. A second aspect is the instability in the life of the couple which is mirrored in skyrocketing divorce rates. A third is the systematic demolition of the "nest notion" of nuclear family life that a new liberation for women has meant: for much of the female population of the Western world, it is turning out that the nest is not best after all. (Shorter, 1977, pp. 269-270)

While quite critical of Shorter on methodological grounds, and arguing from a much different perspective, Lasch (1975, 1977) was not too far from him in claiming that "the family has been slowly coming apart for more than a hundred years" (Lasch, 1977, p. xiv). The chief family function, according to Lasch, is socialization, wherein families mediate for children the frequent conflicts between biological instincts and societal demands. Through the successful resolution of the Oedipal situation, authority (father) and love (mother) are integrated into the developing child's personality. The results are a reality-based concept of authority and a meaningful and workable value system (superego). Modern society, says Lasch, has thwarted this necessary developmental sequence both by separating individuals from their labor (the socialization of production) and by intruding on the family (the socialization of reproduction).

> The socialization of production, followed by the socialization of reproduction, has had two contradictory effects. On the one hand, these changes have laid the material basis for a new form of society, in which collective needs rather than private profit determine the form and content of production. On the other hand, they have made people more and more dependent on the managerial and professional classes—on the great business corporations and the state—and have thus eroded the capacity for self-help and social invention. (Lasch, 1977, p. xv)

Capitalism and professionalism, according to Lasch, have hurt the family. Capitalism hurt by producing the "absent father," thereby creating the child's unrealistic concept of authority and dysfunctional superego. Professionalism hurt by making family members dependent on experts who increasingly usurp family functions. Perhaps preeminent among the family Cassandras, Lasch's final words in his new book are chilling:

> The only alternative to the superego, it has been said, is the superstate . . . . Today the state controls not merely the individual's body but as much of his spirit as it can preempt; not merely his outer but his inner life as well; not merely the public realm but the darkest corners of private life, formerly inaccessible to political domination. The citizen's entire existence has now been subject to social direction, increasingly unmediated by the family or other institutions [cf. Berger & Neuhaus, 1977] to which the work of socialization was once confined. Society itself has taken over socialization or subjected family socialization to increasingly effective control. Having thereby weakened the capacity for self-direction and self-control, it has undermined one of the principal sources of social cohesion, only to create new ones more constricting than the old, and ultimately more devastating in their impact on personal and political freedom. (Lasch, 1977, p. 189)

The reader can see why the subtitle of Lasch's book is "The Family Besieged."

Lasch, an advocate of change, was echoed in part by another contemporary historian, Tamara Hareven, writing in the recent issue of Daedalus devoted to the family:

> Advocates of change have invoked historical precedent to reinforce arguments for reform, while custodians of tradition have invoked it to prove that we are threatened by social breakdown. Throughout American history, the family has been seen as the linchpin of the social order and stable governance. When larger societal processes are reflected in the family they have always been viewed with great anxiety. From the early settlers in Plymouth to modern reformers and social scientists, the fear of the breakdown of the family has haunted American society. Every generation seems to be witnessing difficulties and to be predicting the family's collapse. Social science has provided theoretical formulations for these historical anxieties; the breakdown of traditional family patterns under the impact of social change and modernization has been the standard sociological explanation for the "crisis" of the contemporary family. (Hareven, 1977, p. 69)

But Hareven was not as pessimistic as Lasch about the situation of families, claiming that diversity and flexibility have characterized families throughout American history. Like Shorter and Lasch, Hareven did not deny that there are "complexities, conflicts in roles, and variations imposed on individuals in modern society [that] require an even greater diversity and malleability" (p. 69), but she argued that

> if nothing else, history offers proof that families are able to display variety and diversity in their organization and timing and to contain conflicts between the needs of individuals and the collective demands of the family under changing social conditions . . . . The modern family's growing discomfort suggests the need for expansion and diversity in what we expect from it and in its adaptation to new social conditions with diverse timing schedules and a multiplicity of roles for its members rather than for seeking refuge in a nonexistent past. (p. 69)

Phillippe Ariès (1962), one of the earliest of the recent cadre of scholars interested in the family, has written on the relationship of families to cities. For Ariès (1977), the changing social conditions affecting families, alluded to by Hareven, mostly involve the situation of the city:

> In an attempt to fill the gap created by the decline of the city and the urban forms of social intercourse it had once provided, the omnipotent, omnipresent family took upon itself the task of trying to satisfy all the emotional and social needs of its members. Today, it is clear that the family has failed in its attempts to accomplish that feat, either because the increased emphasis on privacy has stifled the need for social intercourse or because the family has been too completely alienated by public powers. (p. 227)

These demands made upon families, which have often resulted in family failure, derived from three influences related to the decline of cities: (a) the eighteenth century claim by the State that its control and influence should be pervasive, (b) the assignment of work and living to different locations (cf. Kanter, 1977), and (c) the development of an exclusive and passionate love between parents and their children.

Yet another view of the history of American families has been presented in a report of the Carnegie Council entitled All Our Children (Keniston, 1977). John Demos, the Council's resident historian, attempted to demythologize, through historical analysis, two prevailing American assumptions regarding the family:

> Blaming parents and giving them advice both spring from the assumption that the problems of individuals can be solved by changing the individuals who have the problems. This implies a second assumption as well: that families are free-standing, independent, and autonomous units, relatively free from social pressures. If a family proves less than independent, if it is visibly needy, if its members ask for help, then it is by definition not an "adequate" family. Adequate families, the assumption runs, are self-sufficient and insulated from outside pressures. These two assumptions form the core of the American myth of personal self-sufficiency. This myth has deep roots in American history. (Keniston, 1977, p. 9)

Growing from these 200 year old roots, the doctrine of individual self-sufficiency came to be applied to families as well. Consequently, the supremely private family came to be defined as the ideal during the nineteenth century. But the realities of the last two centuries belie the myth.

> In the past then, the intrinsic pleasures of parenthood for most American families were increased by the extrinsic economic return that children brought. Today, parents have children despite their economic cost. This is a major, indeed a revolutionary, change . . . . A second major change in family functions is the removal of education from the family. (Keniston, 1977, p. 15)

Family-based economic production and education are only two of the functions that Keniston, Demos, and colleagues claimed have been usurped by extrafamilial institutions. Others include "the family's shrinking role in the care of the aged, the 'relief' of the poor, the imparting of basic religious attitudes and values, and the care of the mentally ill" (Keniston, 1977, p. 16). This historical transformation of the family has produced a situation where, on the one hand, parents must be strong executives to assess the needs of their families, to manage the resources at their disposal, and to determine the services and environmental supports necessary for family development, while, on the other hand, political, economic, and social factors have historically weakened parents in the executive function.

Perhaps the most optimistic view of the situation of American families has been espoused by Bane (1976), who claimed that families are "here to stay." She did not deny that families are being subjected increasingly to major stresses and strains. Bane, however, interpreted both American history and current social data to suggest that American families have always been, are now, and give evidence of continuing to be robust and remarkably resilient to the abundant political, economic, and social forces which affect them. Her view is close to Hareven's (1977) that there is a need to be realistic about the past and the present in order to help American families deal better with the future.

The question of what did or did not exist in the history of Western and American families is important and far from merely academic. As mentioned above, the past is often cited to justify present research and the need for social reform. A recent example is a report by the National Academy of Science (1976, p. 38) which asserted, among many things, that "Over the past 25 years, profound changes have occurred in the institution bearing primary responsibility for the care and development of the nation's children--the American family. The general trend reveals progressive changes in and fragmentation of the family." But Cohen (1976) raised critical questions regarding historical views of the loss, decay, and dissolution of societal institutions, such as the family. Cohen claimed that

> loss has been found. Again . . . . Divorce and family dissolution are all over the pages of the popular social-science magazines . . . . Loss has recently been taken up by analysts and commentators in a spirit of important discovery, but in fact the idea has been rediscovered regularly for at least the last century and one-half. Loss has been a central, though rather episodic, preoccupation in United States social policy . . . . It evolved the belief that families were failing and produced efforts to shore them up or to replace them with new institutions. (pp. 553-554)

Particularly important to our concerns in this report is Cohen's caution that "intellectuals and policymakers have mostly accepted the calamitous forecasts of social collapse as though they were self-evident and have rarely subjected them to much skeptical poking and prodding" (p. 555).

While we, the authors of this report, are not historians, we advance several conclusions from this brief and selective survey of the history of the family.

1. Because of the scope of their vision and their cast of mind, historians remind us that we must consider broad political, economic, and social factors to understand fully the role of families in child development.

2. Although undoubtedly there have been many changes in the forces affecting families and influencing family structures and functions, we must not be too quick to make the romantic leap that the good old days were better than present times and should be restored.

3. Federal agencies that fund behavioral and social science research on families should not hesitate to support historical studies that elucidate the variables produced by historical events (e.g., Elder's [1974] study of the influence of the Depression on family functioning).

4. The historical analyses of American families known to the authors of this report view the efforts to understand the role of families in child development and the impact of societal institutions on that role as priorities for the research community and its financial underwriters, both private and governmental.

The History of Family Research

Although family research can hardly be called a new field of inquiry--with Olson and Dahl (1977) reporting that there are almost 26,000 English language family studies in the published literature between 1900 and 1976--we believe that the research agenda established by the U. S. Office of Child Development (OCD) in 1974 posed a set of questions that were relatively new to the behavioral and social science research community, as well as to policymakers. Several experts with longstanding and extensive knowledge of the family field who were contacted in the course of preparing this report (Joan Aldous, Reuben Hill, Jerome Kagan) agreed with us that questions regarding the role of families in child development, and the impact of societal institutions on the ability to perform that role, in no way represent the mainstream of family research.

ACYF's current family research effort has developed primarily out of the early childhood intervention efforts of psychologists and educators in the 1960s and early 1970s. Neither of these disciplines has been in the forefront of family research, that distinction belonging to sociologists. As a consequence, many of the questions posed by ACYF-supported researchers, and the methods chosen to answer them, are conceptually and operationally distinct and distant from classical family research endeavors. This situation has its positive and negative aspects. On the positive side, there is the prospect that new, exciting, and innovative research directions will develop within the family research field. On the negative side, however, these researchers are often unaware of many existing theoretical and methodological insights that might shorten the painful process of pioneering in a new (to them) research area. Since, in many respects, the ACYF agenda has broken new ground, one should not expect the use of rigorous and sophisticated methods, and indeed one does not find them often in the projects under review. But these methodological shortcomings should be understood realistically and constructively. The newness of ACYF's emphasis suggests that research that is designed too tightly may be incompatible with the need for description, exploration, and hypothesis generation. This has been, essentially, a heuristic stage in this research area, and evaluation of ACYF projects should be seen in this light. While Bronfenbrenner (1977) argued for rigorous experimental work even in the early stages of this kind of research, we recognize both sides of the argument.

In the remainder of this subsection, we shall discuss the ACYF family research program in an historical context in order to highlight its accomplishments and to develop some of the foundations for recommending new research and program directions. In this highly selective overview, we draw heavily on Lasch's (1977) historical work and recent papers by Hartup (in press) and by Hill and Mattessich (1977).

Christopher Lasch's work, Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged (1977), is at once brilliant, audacious, and remarkably controversial. While we do not agree with Lasch's orthodox Freudian outlook, his viewpoint is valuable. The thesis is that modern society has intruded into the family and made effective resolution of the superego-producing Oedipal situation extremely difficult. Lasch described the threatening intrusions into families by the state and professionals in the late nineteenth century. He related them to the rise of social science and the attempts to establish general theories of family origin and family evolution. Eventual discontent with evolutionary theory gave rise during the 1920s and 1930s to empirical sociological studies of the immediate circumstances of urbanization. During this period, the relationship of culture to personality also was being investigated by psychoanalytically oriented anthropologists who were attempting to determine whether Freud's theory held across diverse cultures and civilizations. The result was a social-anthropological revision of Freud that also was related to emerging feminist concerns. Social pathological studies of families ensued, culminating in the work of Parsons and his followers who emphasized the scientific study of social relations, with a particular interest in the family as a small group. Internal familial interactions became the concern of social therapists who viewed family functions and their role in the socialization of children as intervention's priority concerns. Finally, the implications of nontraditional family styles, such as the so-called matriarchal black family and emerging alternatives to the nuclear family, became concerns of social scientists.

Lasch's analytic survey of social and behavioral studies led him to assert that "Most studies of the family tell us everything except the things we most want to know. Why has family life become so painful, marriage so fragile, relations between parents and children so full of hostility and recrimination?" (Lasch, 1977, p. xvi). But beyond social science's alleged bankruptcy on these important family questions, Lasch connected the threats to society that have required intervention and so-called objective social science:

> The applied science of social control grew up side by side with a pure "science" of society. The two movements exercised a reciprocal influence on each other. Experts in social pathology drew their underlying assumptions from social science; at the same time, practical social therapy defined many of the problems social scientists attempted to solve. No matter how assiduously academic students of society sought to establish the purity of their science and its freedom from assumptions of value, they seldom rose above their preoccupation with questions the urgency of which had already crystallized in the course of clinical practice. (Lasch, 1977, pp. 22-23)

Lasch emphasized throughout that the daily circumstances of American families more often than not precipitated the concerns of social and behavioral scientists, often as a means of rationalizing existing social conditions; the situation was not seen by Lasch as one in which social scientists were predicting from "objective" data the probable future role of the family in society.

Lasch's (1977) analysis portrayed the longstanding interest of the social and behavioral scientists in family functioning. He operated from a sociology of knowledge perspective and cautioned us that the view of the value-free researcher is misleading. In other words, research on the family, ACYF-sponsored or otherwise, must be viewed relative to the existing personal, social, economic, and political context of American society. There is no question that family research activity is on the rise. While we have not been commissioned to determine why this is so, and, moreover, are far from certain on the matter, we caution scientists and policymakers not to ignore the question. We must question continually the assumptions underlying new fads and social movements.

A different perspective on the history of family-related scholarship was presented by Hartup (in press) who reviewed theoretical traditions and methodological contributions over the past 25 years, particularly in developmental psychology. Hartup saw the 1950s as the high-water mark for interest in socialization, the process whereby children become contributing members of society. Psychoanalytic and stimulus-response theories dominated the scene during the fifties and operated within a "social mold" framework wherein parents were viewed as shaping children socially and culturally.

Psychoanalysis was well developed theoretically but its concepts were often difficult to operationalize. As a consequence, its research impact has been limited.

Schools of stimulus-response theory spearheaded by Clark L. Hull, Julian B. Rotter, and B. F. Skinner were extremely productive of empirical research. Hartup argued, however, that failures to deal adequately with biogenetic factors, with the child's influence in the socialization process, with the social/structural and interactional insights of ethology, with the environmental influences identified by the behavioral ecologists, and with issues raised in social activism have led to serious questioning of traditional "social mold" theories. Robert Sears attempted in the 1950s to alert stimulus-response students of family and child development to some of these issues, but Hartup claimed that the studies in the 1960s that emphasized the children's intellectual development thwarted a necessary revision of "social mold" approaches.

Hartup asserted that many family sociologists recognized early the conceptual difficulties in "social mold" approaches and stressed the need for interactional analysis. But he made an important observation about the overall body of family sociological research relative to issues of child development:

> Family sociology, however, has neglected one central concern in the analysis of socialization, i.e., its ontogentic character. In a few instances, notions about human development and family process were intermixed—e.g., in Parsons' writings . . . . But, in recent years, family social science has not dealt very effectively with the interaction between ontogeny and the family context. Most of the family sociological literature is not a developmental literature. Even when developmental analogues are applied to family variables such as marriage, . . . the concept of development is used in a sense that pertains to changes in family relations rather than to changing individuals within these changing contexts. (in press)

Again, the relative newness of the ACYF family research agenda should be underscored. "Social mold" stimulus-response researchers, who have produced an enormous volume of research on child development, have tended to ignore the interactional and transactional processes affecting the role of families in child development. But family sociologists, who have produced an enormous volume of research on families, have tended to ignore child development variables.

This last point made by Hartup, a developmental psychologist, is echoed by one of the experts we contacted in the project, Reuben Hill, a family sociologist, who wrote:

> My impression of the child development literature at the moment is one of stalemate between irreconcilable theoretical orientations, all essentially personological. The best of the past research completed seems to be pointing to new dimensions where the research is as yet poorly designed

> and of low yield. Much of family and child research is still unidirectional, parent molding child, missing the influences of siblings, and worse still, missing entirely the child's role in shaping his own role casting within the family [a point also made by Hartup]. Until family and child research focuses on parent-child interactions and begins to examine the bonding processes that flow from such interactions we will be short-changed in our understanding of the role of families in child development.
>
> Family scholars for their part have been myopically interested in understanding marriage and family behavior as such at the expense of assessing the impacts of such behavior on the personality development of individuals. They have hardly begun to make the contribution they might make at this interface between family and child. The interest of family scholars in family development has led them to treat the changing competences and developmental tasks of growing children as input variables, disruptive of family organization and of marital satisfactions of spouses and their contributions have therefore been less than they might have been had they observed the interesting interactions between and among all of the family's sub-systems. (Personal Communication, January 4, 1978)

It is important that ACYF's additional interest in the influence of family-institution transactions on child development is even more on the cutting-edge of research than work discussed by Hartup and Hill on the role of families in child development.

The final approach we present to help understand the history of family-related research involves the Hill and Mattessich (1977) effort to update and advance family development theory. Originally formulated in 1947 by Evelyn M. Duvall and Reuben Hill to help integrate family research for the 1948 White House National Conference on Family Life, family development theory is among the most promising approaches to family study. It was grounded at the outset in family research and service conceptualizations and is unique in dealing with the life-span developmental changes of families. It has drawn on rural sociology, child psychology, the sociology of work, and the structure-function approach. Its major concepts involve the family as a system, family structures, the goal orientation of family functioning, and the processes of families over their life histories.

As a vehicle for advancing family development theory, Hill and Mattessich (1977) described historically parallel scholarly traditions that are potentially related to family development and that they feel might be useful if encompassed by their approach:

> We recognize that family development scholarship has been running parallel to three other streams of research and theory: 1) *developmental psychology*; cognitive development, social emotional and pro-social development (mostly ending with adolescence) and life span development with its added accent on career developments of middle adulthood and later maturity; 2) *the sociology of age stratification* which includes attention to age roles and social structure, the variable life courses of historical cohorts, and the issues of intergenerational differences, continuity and social change; and 3) *the sociology of participation in and utilization of social kinship networks and voluntary associations*. The scholars of the second group (Riley, Brim, Bengston, Elder, and Clausen) have opened up new vistas of personality and social structure through age and generation analyses but have not bridged the family-personality development chasm. The third group of scholars (Bott, Mitchell, Litwak, Farber, and others) have linked family and networks provocatively but have not specified the developmental dimension of family transactions . . . . Since the developmental psychology groups show interest in transcending their present stalemate between the mechanistic and organismic approaches to consider dyadic and group properties in developmental research, it seems timely to bring about some reduction of the lag between the three communities and with it an increased sophistication of family development theory and research. (p. 5, emphasis added)

In addition to highlighting the utility of integrating perspectives, a theme to which we shall return in a subsequent section of this report, this statement summarizes succinctly some important themes and approaches related to the ACYF research program.

Our overview of the history of family research highlighted several points.

1. Although coming after the publication of more than 26,000 studies of families, the ACYF family research program has posed a set of questions that is relatively new to the behavioral and social science research community, as well as to policymakers.

2. Since the ACYF research agenda breaks new ground, the generation of fruitful theoretical approaches, testable hypotheses, and promising research and program directions has been more important at this stage than has methodological rigor and sophistication.

3. Family research and social ills befalling families have

always gone hand in hand, and will probably continue to do so. Studies of causation regarding stress and turmoil in families have failed to tell us what we most want to know regarding reasons for the heightened experience of stress and turmoil by today's American families.

4. Traditional "social mold" approaches to the study of the role of families in child development probably have outlived their usefulness.

5. Neither traditional approaches to child development research nor traditional family sociological studies have been adequate to the concerns of the ACYF family research program.

6. The influence of family institution transactions on child development has been a particularly neglected area of research.

7. The family development approach pioneered by Reuben Hill is a promising one, especially if combined with the approaches of developmental psychology, the sociology of age stratification, and the sociology of social networks.

Chapter 2

METHOD

The general method used to prepare this report included: (a) determining the relevant universe of family research reports; (b) selecting from this universe the studies most relevant to examining the ACYF family research program; (c) depending on the nature of the study, subjecting it to one of several kinds of review, ranging from mere notation of the findings to intensive scrutiny on both substantive and methodological grounds; (d) preparing integrated summaries of findings and their methodological adequacy with particular emphasis on providing direction for future research and demonstration efforts; and (3) specifying implications and recommendations derived from the preceding review and analysis. The effort addressed the question, What are the next steps toward insuring that future family and child development research and programs are more effective, appropriate, and accessible?

In two sections of this chapter we shall describe (a) the universe of research reports and the methods we used to obtain it, and (b) our review and analysis procedures.

The Universe of Studies

Material that contributed to the substance of this report was derived from the following sources: (a) those projects funded since 1974 by ACYF in its family research program for which data were available for review and analysis; (b) an ACYF-funded longitudinal study conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS); (c) an ACYF-funded national collaborative study of the persistence of preschool effects as determined by a long-term follow-up of 14 infant and preschool experiments; (d) selected ACYF demonstration programs for which evaluation data were available; (e) federally funded research on families since 1974, located through the Information System of the Social Research Group (SRG) at George Washington University; (f) published research since 1973 on the family as a system, located through the NIMH Clearinghouse on Mental Health Information; (g) exemplary studies nominated by a panel of experts chosen for our study; (h) selected studies in the literature; (i) four University of Minnesota bibliographies on research in marriage and the family conducted between 1900 and 1976 (Aldous & Dahl, 1974; Aldous & Hill, 1967; Olson & Dahl, 1975, 1977); (j) Family Therapy and Research: An Annotated Bibliography (Glick & Haley, 1971); and (k) key papers prepared by the SRG on various aspects of federally funded family research programs.

The ACYF family research program was defined by projects specified in the Request for Proposal and additional ACYF projects mentioned in recent SRG publications. Appendix A lists those ACYF projects which were available for review and analysis.

The ETS longitudinal study has been in operation since the late 1960s and has produced a great number of research reports. Appendix B lists those reviewed for this report.

The national collaborative study of the long-term effects of early childhood intervention programs was a joint endeavor of the Education Commission of the States and Cornell University. While data analyses are still in progress, we were able to review and analyze a two-volume report made available in fall 1977.

Project evaluations from ACYF's Home Start and Parent Child Development Centers were also included in our effort.

At the time of our work, the SRG Information System contained about 800 projects in varying stages of completion. Of those, 125 were considered particularly relevant to this project. Where results were available and the project staff judged that a given study either provided background or rounded out a given ACYF research area, that study was reviewed. Thus we made highly selective use of the SRG system. The NIMH Clearinghouse material was used in a similar fashion.

In order to help us understand the context of the ACYF family research program, and so as not to miss particularly important pieces of research conducted over the years, we chose scholars and researchers in the area and asked them to nominate the five or so most important studies ever conducted on the role of families in child development and the influence of family-institution transactions on that role. Both substantive contribution and methodological excellence were specified as criteria for nomination. Appendix C lists the members of our panel of experts and their nominated studies. As in the other groups of projects, the nominated studies were used selectively to provide background or to round out a given ACYF research area. This same selection process was used for the published literature.

The bibliographies by Aldous and Dahl (1974), Aldous and Hill (1967), Olson and Dahl (1975, 1977), and Glick and Haley (1971) were used primarily to determine the general nature, scope, and evident trends of prior research in ACYF-related areas.

The SRG reports were used selectively to provide continuity between previous review and analytic efforts and the present project.

In summary, the projects in the ACYF family research program and relevant ACYF demonstrations constituted the focus of our efforts. Studies identified through all other sources were used in a highly selective fashion to provide background for this report and to round out the view of ACYF research areas.

Procedures for Review and Analysis

An Analysis of Family Research Data review manual and a related review form were developed for this project and are presented in Appendix D. This review and analysis procedure was applied to each ACYF-funded family research project that contained data at the time of our study. A less systematic and detailed approach was used for all other studies contributing to this report.

Several issues were addressed in constructing the review manual and review form. First, we wanted to capture both the authors' claims and our own judgments on the objectives, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of ACYF projects. Second, while differing somewhat in approach from the SRG, we wanted our efforts to be reasonably compatible with its previous work. Finally, the analysis required to address the questions posed by ACYF required consideration of both internal and external validity. Internal validity addresses the issue of the ambiguity of research findings: perfectly unambiguous findings have perfect internal validity. External validity addresses the issue of generalizability of research findings: findings universally generalizable to all people, settings, and times have perfect external validity. Perfect validity is never possible, and often these two forms of validity are reciprocal. Ambiguity is reduced by control, but control introduces artificiality and makes findings less generalizable to real world circumstances. We designed our approach, therefore, to allow us to consider questions of both internal and external validity.

The major topics of the review instrument were: type of research project; considerations of external validity including research setting, sample selection, family types studies, characteristics of the subjects; considerations of internal validity including design sophistication, adequacy of operational definitions, measurement fidelity, adequacy of data analysis, research logic, representativeness of sample, nature of the treatment; the strengths and weaknesses of the study; research issues and recommendations; and program issues and recommendations. The internal validity section borrowed heavily from the Gephart and Bartos (1969) approach for profiling research studies.

The review procedure was construed as a device for yielding standard information on projects and enabling reviewers to make reasonable and systematic judgments about research methodology, rather than as a psychometrically precise and well-validated instrument. Although we wanted all reviewers to use the same evaluative constructs and to evaluate projects in a fashion as similar as possible, the instrument did not lend itself to easy determination of interrater reliability. Rather than to test for reliability, we chose to have the reviewers meet frequently to discuss their ratings in order to enhance rating accuracy and consistency.

There were five reviewers, one person with a doctorate in developmental psychology and four advanced graduate students in psychology and early childhood education at Peabody College. The reviewers were assisted by a project coordinator and a statistical expert and were supervised by three psychologists who had primary responsibility for preparing this report.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

The ACYF-funded family research studies examined for this report fall into three major categories: (a) child-rearing and intrafamilial relationships, (b) intervention into individual and family developmental processes, and (c) family-institution relationships.

Child-rearing and Intrafamily Relationships

The rearing and socialization of children have been studied by psychologists, educators, and sociologists for several decades. ACYF's interest is expressed in several of its family research studies which focus on selected aspects of children's development and the impact of various intrafamily relationships.

Psychologists' concern for child development has focused traditionally on the individual child, whose development has been studied and often treated as a self-contained process occurring in isolation from the family. The flow of theoretical and empirical work in the area, however, has moved toward a conceptualization of children's development as a process occurring within a dynamic environment, which itself must be examined if developmental processes in individual children are to be understood and optimized. The socialization of children and child-rearing processes have come to be seen as dominant themes during the first period of a lifespan developmental process. The process occurs within the context of intrafamily relationships, the family's own development as a social system, and the family's relationship with other social structures and events.

History of Research

Several streams of theoretical and methodological thought have contributed to research in child development and intrafamily relationships. Early research in developmental psychology centered around a simple effort to determine what most children do and what patterns their development follows. Sears (1975) described G. Stanley Hall's efforts in the late 1800s to assess specific aspects of children's behavior through questionnaires distributed to school teachers, whom Hall saw as having important opportunities to observe children's activities. Hall's work exemplified the beginnings of a normative approach to the study of children's social development. Gesell's subsequent work (e.g., Gesell, Thompson, & Amatruda, 1938) was considerably more precise and detailed, but was aimed also at determining both how children develop and what they do as they develop. These lines of inquiry were distinctly child-focused; attention to the context of individual development was yet to come.

Major longitudinal studies begun in the 1930s (e.g., Bayley, 1933, 1956) came a step closer to explicit considerations of family influences on child development, for they raised questions about developmental processes and the conditions under which they occur. The longitudinal studies were complemented by work growing out of both psychoanalytic and behavioral concepts. Work in these two fields focused primarily on determining why children exhibit specific behavioral and developmental patterns and on determining the conditions which elicit specified behavioral patterns. Research from both schools of thought (e.g., Bowlby, 1958; Burlingham & Freud, 1944; A. Freud, 1937; Miller & Dollard, 1941; Skinner, 1948, 1957), served to draw attention to the effects of selected intrafamily relationships on children's social behaviors and development. Much of this work, however, made relatively simple assumptions about children and the causes of their behavior. The child was often seen as passive, receptive, responsive, and seldom displaying significant initiative. As noted clearly by Hartup (in press), most research at this time remained in the child-centered mold. There was only minor attention to individual temperament, the reciprocity of family-individual relationships, or the ecological framework within which families and their children develop.

In ecological psychology, several theoretical and empirical efforts were underway which would contribute subsequently to contemporary consideration of children's development within families (Gump, 1975). Lewin's (1954) work raised clearly the importance of the reciprocity of the individual and the environment. In discussing the properties of the "organism-in-a-field," Lewin noted that behavioral patterns are a function not of the organism or the environment alone, but rather a function of a close and intertwined relationship between the two. Barker's (1965, 1968) focus on behavior settings contained several concepts important to the developmental researcher, among them the following: individual opportunities and constraints come from the setting within which the individual operates; individual experiences are influenced by the setting; the individual is part of the setting but also uses it purposefully.

Sociology also has contributed important concepts for the study of families and children. As described by Hill and Hansen (1960), and subsequently by Nye and Bernardo (1966), the developmental approach in sociology examines the family—seen as a unit composed of interacting personalities—as it passes through stages of a developmental life cycle. The family development approach considers the family as an entity in a state of continual change; this change, generally marked by an increase or decrease in nuclear family membership, occurs for the family both as a self-contained entity and as a social institution that affects and is affected by society (Glick, 1975; Malpass & Robinson, 1977). The structural-functinal approach also has particular relevance to the study of families. Derived largely from the theoretical work of Parsons and Bales (1955), this approach considers the family to be a special type of small group with associated structure and functions. The focus of attention on internal characteristics of the family begun by Parsons and Bales has been carried on in research on intrafamily variables such as roles, division of labor, and position of siblings. Their methodology has facilitated study of the quality of family functioning and has enriched the potential for understanding critical elements of children's socioemotional development.

Concepts from three theoretical orientations--developmental psychology, ecological psychology, and family sociology--form a framework to study child development and intrafamily relations, which is distinctly richer than the historically predominant approaches. Indeed, exemplary research in the familial context of children's development has used multiple conceptual perspectives and methodologies (e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971).

Sameroff and Chandler (1975) have summarized major trends in child development research. At the simplest conceptual level, developmental research has focused on linear or main-effects models of growth. Much research based on psychoanalytic and behavioral frameworks falls into this category; it focuses on critical events early in life which determine directly subsequent outcomes, or it posits singular inputs as causing specific behavioral outcomes. At a second conceptual level, Sameroff and Chandler described an interactive framework, within which researchers and practitioners have attempted to predict developmental outcomes based on the attributes of individuals and the environment. The framework is essentially static and usually does not incorporate change over time into the prediction of outcomes. Several intervention research and demonstration programs of the 1960s were based on such a model of development. At a third conceptual level, Sameroff and Chandler described a transactional model. This conceptual framework makes several assumptions important to the study of children's development. First, it assumes that there is a continuous interplay between the individual and the environment. Second, individuals are seen as active and the environment as plastic; the individual--whether infant or adult--is viewed as participating actively in its own growth, and in frequent attempts to adapt and structure the world. Third, the constants in this framework are found primarily not in characteristics of the organism or environment, but in the processes by which individual traits are maintained or altered in transactions between the organism and the environment.

The concept of transactions between individuals and the environment thus has evolved as a major focal point of inquiry in developmental and family research. Static or unitary conceptions of childhood development and socialization--which often give rise to assumptions of deficits in functioning among children or families who deviate from a commonly accepted norm—have been replaced in some inquiries by conceptions of a developmental continuum. Along such a continuum are arrayed individual characteristics, family strengths and stresses, and interactive developmental and social outcomes. The focus thus has moved from simple normative conceptualizations about single-point interventions assumed necessary to enhance normal development and socialization. The focus would seem now to rest on the identification of strengths within individual and family systems; the identification of stress points and degrees of stress that hamper family ability to nurture the growth and development of its children; and the identification of potential interventions at stress points that will support strengths within the familial and environmental context of children's growth and development.

The 12 studies within ACYF's family research program that were examined for this portion of the report reflected in varying degrees an interactional or transactional approach. Within these studies, four major themes of importance to children's development emerged: the role of family status variables vs. family process variables; the role of individual resources and constitutional variables; the role of parental attitudes and expectations; and the impact of parental relations on extra-familial persons and institutions. These four themes form the organizational framework for the review of studies that follows.

ACYF Research Relative to That of Other Agencies

The ecological and service orientations of ACYF's research program are clearly evident when one examines the focus of early childhood research by funding agencies. In 1975, only 5% of ACYF's (then OCD) early childhood research was focused on traditional child development research (Hertz, 1976). Only one other agency, the Office of Education, had so small a proportion (2%) of its total research in basic child development. However, an additional 21% of ACYF research and demonstration focused on child development and the broader ecology: the family, broader social and physical environments, and service/intervention programs. In this broader context, ACYF appeared at the median. Five agencies showed a larger proportion of their research focused on child development within the above contexts (Bureau of Community Health, 41%; National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 36%; National Institute of Mental Health, 29%; National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke, 24%; National Institute on Drug Abuse, 22%), and five showed a smaller proportion of their research in these areas (Department of Agriculture, 20%; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 19%; National Institute of Education, 17%; Office of Education, 11%; and Rehabilitation Services Administration, 0%).

What is Known and With What Degree of Confidence?

Several ACYF family research program studies were examined for this portion of the report. Strongest consideration was given to studies for which final reports or substantive data were available. Those studis included the following:

Bell: *Cognitive Development in Early Childhood* (OCD-90-C-261)
Hock: *Alternative Approaches to Child Rearing and Their Effects on The Mother-Infant Relationship* (OCD-CB-490)
Shipman: *ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study*

Additional studies in ACYF's family research program, for which interim reports or some data analyses were available, were also considered in this section. Those studies included the following:

Carrasco: *The Chicano Child and His Neighborhood: Intellectual, Social, and Cultural Impact* (OCD-90-C-633)[1]
Goldberg: *Development of Parental Attachment* (OCD-90-C-388)
Greenberg: *Parental Mediation of Children's Social Learning from Television* (OCD-90-C-365)
Grow: *A Study of Child-Rearing by Young White Mothers* (OCD-CB-456)
Hardy: *Ecological Influences in The Socialization of The Urban Child* (OCD-90-C-572)
Nobles: *Changing Child-Rearing Orientation and Black Child Development* (OCD-90-C-901)
Padilla: *Socialization Processes among Mexican-Americans: A Sociolinguistic Analysis* (OCD-90-C-905)
Parke: *Father-Infant Interaction: Assessment and Modification* (OCD-90-C-900)
Ryan: *Children's Understanding of Socio-Moral Rules Through Family Interaction* (OCD-90-C-902)

Family status and family process variables. Traditionally, the impact of intrafamily relationships on the child has been viewed primarily as a function of the status of the family, usually conceptualized in terms of socioeconomic status, race, or ethnic identification (e.g., Elkin & Handel, 1978). Continued heavy reliance on status variables, however, holds the danger of maintaining a unidirectional view of simple cause-and-effect relationships. Such a view ignored reciprocal causality; it precludes consideration of interactional processes that may underlie and mediate the effects frequently correlated with status variables.

---

[1] Carrasco undertook a descriptive, observational study of Chicano children's behavior, interactions, and social groupings in three outdoor locations (rural, inner-city with single family dwellings, and inner-city with multiple family dwellings). Focal points of his study were the following: the nature of the outdoor neighborhood of the low-income Chicano child; occupation and movement patterns of the child in the neighborhood; and activities and socialization patterns of the child in the neighborhood that might be used in the educational setting. Although a large amount of data were gathered in the study, the findings were limited by lack of external validity. Because the study focused only on children—rather than children in relation to the family—it is not discussed further in this report.

Following the lead of several investigators who have taken a departure from the view that families within status variables are homogeneous and function in similar ways (e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Clarke-Stewart, 1973; Werner, Bierman, & French, 1971), several ACYF studies have focused on features of family processes, across status variables, that appear to affect children's development.

Shipman's longitudinal study[2] provides an exemplary foray in the relationship between selected status and family process variables. The 1,017 families in the study entered when the target child was 3-1/2 to 4-1/2 years of age. The last published reports available to us contained data on the children through the third grade (ages 8-1/2 to 9-1/2). In general, Shipman found considerable variation in family processes within the group, especially in such variables as parent-child interaction patterns, parental perceptions of the child, extra-family activities, and parental use and knowledge of community resources. She concluded that status variables and processes are interrelated as they affect the child and that family process variables are the "underlying mechanisms by which child outcome differences associated with family status characteristics are created and maintained" (B, 14, 167).[3]

Shipman asked what percentages of the variance in child outcomes may be related to status and process variables, respectively, and how much of the variance is shared between the two types of variables. Using a commonality analysis, she found that the shared variance was much more important than the contributions of either status or process variables alone. She suggested that

---

[2] Where reference is made to the general body of work, ACYF reports contained in Appendix A or B are referenced throughout this report without dates. Published literature is referenced in standard APA style and is included in the references.

[3] Throughout this report, references to quotations from ACYF study reports refer to appendix, study, report, and page numbers. For instance A, II, 1, 14-20 refers to Appendix A, Study II, Report 1, pages 14-20. Study numbers are omitted in Appendix B, thus the reference to B, 14, 167 refers to Appendix B, Report 14, page 167.

> most of the predictive ability of status measures found in numerous other studies may have been due to variability in family processes that covaried with the status indicators. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the status/situational and process variables are measuring the same thing. Instead, the association between them might be best understood as reflecting differential provision of opportunities for particular processes to emerge. (B, 14, 153)

Shipman also addressed the issue of stability and change in both status and process variables over time. She found, in general, that status variables tended to have moderate to high stability while process variables showed considerable change over time within individual families. Some of Bell's findings also indicate the potential importance of change over time in status and process variables related to on-going developmental processes. In her sample of infants, for example, she found that person permanence was associated primarily with the quality of infant-mother attachment, while object permanence was affected by different process factors at different infant ages. In the first year, object permanence was associated only with "floor freedom"--the opportunity to move about and explore independently. In the second year, however, it was associated increasingly with the quality of infant-mother attachment, prolonged maternal interaction with the infant, and the mother's introduction of the infant to varied and complex stimulation.

Goldberg's early findings (available so far only in draft form on infants from birth to 4 months of age)also examined changes in parent-infant interactions over time for both full-term and premature infant groups. In general, as infant age increased, parents were less likely to stimulate infants to eat. However, parent behavior was seen to be more stable than infant behavior in the feeding situation. Some group differences also were found, in that premature infants were less alert and responsive than full term infants, and were more likely to be stimulated repeatedly to elicit feeding behavior in the neonatal period. Evidence linking neonatal infant behavior to parent behavior during subsequent feedings was suggestive but not conclusive. Shipman's, Bell's, and Goldberg's findings all draw attention to the importance of assessing changes in process variables over time and the importance of examining those process variables in relation to the course of child development.

Several status variables have been examined in ACYF studies. Investigators have attempted to examine a range of process variables associated with differential outcomes between and within status variable groups. Socioeconomic status was examined in several ACYF studies. Bell, for example, examined infant-mother interaction as related to socioeconomic status (SES) with respect to the infant's development of object permanence. Although SES and race were confounded in this study, Bell found some differences in the development of object and person permanence across SES groups for infants who had harmonious relationships with their mothers. There were more significant differences between SES groups, however, for infants who had disharmonious relationships with their mothers. Low SES was thus seen as affecting the infant in relation to the quality of mother-infant interaction and the child's developmental phase (an SES x type of infant-mother relationship x developmental level interaction). Where mother-infant relationships were disharmonious, low-SES babies scored significantly lower on person and object permanence at 11 months of age than did middle-SES babies. At 14-1/2 months, infants who had harmonious relationships with the mother showed SES-related differences: low-SES infants within this group scored lower on object permanence than did middle-SES infants. Bell concluded that the mother-infant relationship "is even more crucial in the cognitive development of poor infants than it is for the middle-class group?"(A, II, 1, 50). Process variables of particular importance to infant outcomes in this study were the quality of mother-infant attachment and the mother's provision of opportunity for frequent and prolonged interaction during which the infant was introduced to varied and complex stimulation.

Grow, investigating a group of single and married young white mothers with respect to their well-being and the well-being of their infants, examined several mother and infant variables which might be associated with and clarify the effect of the mother's SES. She looked at the mothers' motivation for parenthood, attitudes toward their children, social functioning, parenting problems they encountered, services available to them, and services they used. In a preliminary analysis of factors affecting the decision of single mothers to keep their children, Grow found that SES alone did not predict the decision, as had been suggested previously. Other analyses from the study, while apparently intended for use in description and diagnosis rather than in support of any hypothesis, may provide useful information about the variety of experience of same-SES mothers; they may also suggest ways of designing effective interventions that take this variety into account.

Hardy, too, investigated variability in low-SES black and white inner-city families. She attempted to describe the functioning of low-SES inner-city families in relatively specific terms and to relate these descriptive findings to child outcomes. Through a structured interview, she sought to obtain information about the families' experience of stress. Sources of potential stress included in the survey were inadequacy of income, dissatisfaction with work and family life, ill health, poor housing, marital conflict, problems with other children, relatives, neighbors, school personnel, and school policy. While methodological problems attend the use of data from the interview form, and while the results of the study may be more descriptive than conclusive, the theoretical model suggested dimensions of experience of low-SES inner-city families that may have a bearing on differences in child outcomes.

Family structure as a status variables has also been examined for component processes in some ACYF studies. Grow, for example, defined the primary question of interest in her study as one of family structure. She compared a sample of young, white, single mothers with a sample of married mothers matched for age, race, and parity, to determine whether there were differences between the two groups in the well-being of mothers and children. The potentially simple conceptualization of family structure as single or married, however, was expanded to include information about the single mother's relationships with her own family, relationship to the child's father, and the birth of other children. Although mother and child form a family in the narrow sense, inclusion of the mother's extended family and the unmarried father indicate recognition of an important transition phase in the development of a new family. Data from her study, when analyzed, may suggest ways in which community-based supports required by single parents vary depending on extended family supports already available.

Hardy also examined family structure. Her interest was in exploring the relationship between child outcomes and family type (classified as nuclear, extended, single parent, juvenile, and communal). Based on information about the prevalence of marital instability in inner-city populations, she suggested that the number of changes in structure over time may be as important to child outcomes as the type of structure itself. A preliminary finding that children whose mothers' marital status changed had lower mean IQ scores than did children whose mothers' marital status remained the same--whether married or single--supports the potential importance of changes in structure and in the processes attendant in those changes.

The Hardy study and studies by Padilla and Nobles also attempted to examine processes associated with family structure in other ways. Hardy, for example, asked mothers to report on the division of labor among family members. While she presented no clear hypothesis concerning the effects of division of labor, her question acknowledged the potential importance of such processes within and across family types for child outcomes. Padilla's study included attention to extended family and kinship networks, even where children were living in traditional two-parent nuclear families, and attempted to assess the role of children's contacts with extended family members in the development of social skills. Although Nobles did not measure family functioning directly, he was aware of the potential importance of role functioning and "who does what" within families, insofar as he hypothesized more role flexibility among members of black families than in the typical American family.

Ethnicity as a status variable has also been examined with reference to associated processes in at least two ACYF studies. Padilla addressed the question of minority status, and asked how aspects of language and cultural differences might affect the socialization of children. He examined ways in which length of a family's time in the United States (first generation vs. third generation) and the language preference of the parents might be meaningful dimensions of minority status as it affects the family and the child. Nobles, too, attempted to address the question of how the minority status of a family affects the child's socialization. While his data did not allow definitive responses to the question, two of his assumptions are of interest because they call attention to examining processes within status variables. He assumed first that being black in a white-dominated society does not have the same effect on all families, but varies as a function of each family's cultural perspective. He also assumed that the child's experience, in addition to the family's experience as a whole, affects child-rearing practices. As his assumptions may explain processes associated with ethnic status, it might be useful to follow Nobles's lead and clarify ways in which these process factors affect families and children.

In addition to focusing on general processes associated with status variables, some ACYF studies have focused on specific processes in an effort to explain child outcomes. Shipman examined several process variables through a mother-child interaction task and found the child's cognitive performance up to age nine to have the strongest relationship, concurrently and predictively, to the following process variables: mother's use of a proactive teaching style, requests for verbal feedback, expression of affection, use of positive feedback and praise, reliance on appeals other than status-normative ones, language specificity, and differentiated and positive statements about school. Through a maternal interview, Shipman found significant positive relationships between the children's academic achievement through age nine and the following process variables: mothers' social involvement in the preschool years; the parents' early efforts to enhance their own education; and parents' rating of their child as "more mature" at age four. The strongest relationship revealed by the maternal interviews, however, was that between the children's academic achievement and mothers' educational expectations and aspirations for their children. Using part correlations, Shipman demonstrated the added predictive power of mothers' educational expectancy for children's cognitive performance in the sixth year of the study over the estimate of children's cognitive performance obtained by the Preschool Inventory in the first year of the study.

Bell also tapped process variables by a maternal interview and found that frequency of mothers' play with their babies and frequency of outings with the infants were important variables for the children's short-term cognitive outcomes. (Shipman, however, found frequency of early excursions outside of the home to be unrelated to later academic achievement.)

Both Nobles and Padilla also examined specific family processes as related to subsequent child outcomes. The Nobles study was designed to obtain a measure of family process through analysis of videotapes of family discussions of child-rearing. The variables of interest were focused on affective interaction; Nobles was concerned with determining how black child-rearing practices develop black children's distinguishing sense of unconditional love in spite of anger and punishment. Unfortunately, his technique for gathering relevant data—while strong in the sense that it allowed inclusion of all family members rather than one speaking for the whole—seemed less likely to generate important information about child-rearing practices than would the videotaping of a task directly involving some aspect of child-rearing practices in a natural setting. The Padilla study considered family effects on child outcomes as related to verbal interaction processes. The verbal interactions of family dyads were recorded so that comparisons of the amount and type of interaction among all family members could be made. Padilla's method (using tape recording, transcription, coding and analysis) was time consuming and limited the number of families in the study. At the same time, however, it provided a direct measure of family interaction processes and seems promising in providing answers to the question being asked: Do sociolinguistic patterns of family members influence child outcomes?

Individual resources and constitutional variables. The importance of the interaction between individual variables and environmental factors in influencing individual development has been discussed by several researchers (Brazelton, 1973; Brazelton, Koslowski, & Main, 1974; Stern, 1977; Thomas, Chess, & Birch, 1968; Yarrow, Rubenstein, & Pederson, 1975). The ACYF studies made only minor contribution to knowledge in this area as it affects infancy and early development but gave the area an important new dimension as related to school-age children.

Ryan proposed to study children's own construction of moral rule systems at 6, 9, and 14 years of age as they interact with parents' reasons for rule giving. Only the pilot data generated during the development of the research interview instrument were available from this project. These data suggested that children constructed different types of rules for peers and parents. For peers, rules were cooperative in nature, reciprocity was expected, and the consequence of rule violation was breaking of the relationship. For parents, rules were constraining, no reciprocity was expected, and the consequence of rule violation was punishment. The researcher's attention to the child's own contribution in the development of a moral rule system was unusual and important.

Of the studies with data available for analysis, only Hock noted the possibility of a constitutional variable affecting infant outcomes during the first year of life. Hock found that infant fussing in the 3-month feeding situation was related significantly to fretting in the mother's absence at 8 months; she found further that fretting in the mother's absence was related to greater distress in a "strange situation" and that wariness of a stranger and distress at a brief separation from the mother at 8 months predicted distress in the "strange situation" at 12 months. She concluded that more research is needed to "substantiate the existance of stable infant traits of the sort suggested" (A, XIII, 1, 137).

Shipman, in the ETS longitudinal project, examined the presence and operation of response tempo in school-aged children. The context of this examination was the school rather than the family. The relationship of response tempo to personal-social behaviors and cognitive development in the classroom was the target of examination. Using a measurement from the Sigel Object Categorization Task before preschool entry, the investigators found three response latency subgroups which were related differentially to personal-social behaviors in the classroom.

Children who were fast responders tended to be relatively aggressive, unaffectionate, less involved in peer relationships, and less likely to engage in cognitive or fantasy activities in the classroom. They did, however, show increases in autonomous achievement during the school year. In addition, an interaction was found between fast response tempo and cognitive skill. Fast responders who were bright, as measured by the Preschool Inventory, adapted increasingly well over time to the preschool situation, while fast responders who were less bright tended to withdraw increasingly during the school year. In general, teachers judged children who were fast responders as relatively difficult to teach.

Children who responded with moderate speed on the latency task were the most interpersonally cooperative, showed more positive affect, were less aggressive, and showed greater levels of cognitive and fantasy activity than did the fast or slow responders. However, these children's level of autonomous achievement declined over the year. In addition, the relationship between cognitive skills and social behavior became attenuated over the school year in this group; this was interpreted to mean that "a moderate response tempo can compensate for a relatively low level of cognitive skills, at least with regard to the child's assertiveness within the classroom" (B, 4, 44). In general, these children were judged by teachers as easiest to teach.

Children who were slow responders had personal-social behavior patterns similar to those of the moderate responders, except that they were less cooperative. Like moderate responders, they seemed to adapt quite well to the preschool environment. There was also an interaction between response tempo and cognitive skill in this group; slow responders who were bright became increasingly withdrawn during the year relative to slow responders who were less bright. In general, children in this group were judged more difficult to teach than moderate responders.

The relationship of response tempo, personal-social behavior patterns, and cognitive growth to family variables was examined tangentially. No relationship was found between family background variables and response tempo and there was little evidence of an influence of family background variables on children's personal-social behaviors in the classroom. Family background and family process variables, such as maternal education and children's cooperation with a mother in a task situation, however, were found to influence the children's rates of cognitive growth, and cognitive skill was related to children's personal-social behaviors. The authors hypothesized that "children's personal-social behaviors in contexts outside the family are more directly influenced at this age by the family's stimulation of the child's cognitive growth than by direct socialization of personal-social behaviors per se within the family context" (B, 4, 51).

The question of consistency over time in intra individual variables is important when considering the role of individual resources in development. Historically, developmental psychologists have made an assumption of linear predictability, or continuity of development, over the life span. In this light, constitutional variables are seen as input variables which are consistent over time. A transactional perspective, however, views the expression of constitutional variables as a function of interaction with environmental variables. Thomas and Chess (1977) put it well when they stated:

> Continuity and predictability can thus not be assumed for a specific attribute or pattern of the child, whether it be temperament, intellectual functioning, motivational attributes or psychodynamic defenses. What is predictable is the process of organism-environment interaction. Consistency in development will come from continuity over time in the organism and significant features of the environment. Discontinuity will result from changes in one or the other which make for modification and change in development. (pp. 173-174)

There is some evidence in the ETS study that response tempo is modifiable over time as a function of interaction with environmental variables. Children whose teachers gave minimal emphasis to evaluating their cognitive performance--through nonindividuation or autonomy-granting teaching techniques--no longer had slow response tempos when measured again on the Sigel Object Categorization Task at the end of the school year.

Parental expectations and change in expectations and attitudes over time. The relationship of expectations to child outcomes has been studied most often in relation to the effect of teachers' expectations on the classroom performance of children. Rosenthal and Jacobsen's (1968) finding of powerful effects of teachers' expectations on children's academic performance created much controversy and a stream of related research. Recent studies indicate the value of continued research on expectation effects (Dusek & O'Connell, 1973; Goebes & Shore, 1975; Mendels & Flanders, 1973), particularly as they involve contributions of the child to the teacher-child interaction (Finn, 1972). Some of the child variables of interest in the study of expectations may be generated in the child's interactions with family members and may be influenced by parental expectations regarding the child's educational attainment.

Shipman examined the effects on child outcomes of maternal expectations and aspirations for children's educational attainment. In one of the most powerful findings of the study, maternal expectations and aspirations were related significantly to children's achievement level. Maternal expectations had significant concurrent relationships with child achievement; there was also a strong relationship between maternal expectations in the first year of the study and child achievement in the sixth year of the study.

In order to remove statistically the effects of maternal expectations in the first study year from the correlations in the sixth study year between maternal expectations and child academic achievement, Shipman performed a series of part correlations. In these part correlations race differences were found on the maternal expectation variable. Part correlations to the child's math and Raven Colored Progressive Matrices performance were significantly lower in the black sample than in the white sample. The part correlation for reading was not significantly different for black children than for white children, but was in the same direction as the others (reading: .19 vs. .38; math: 17 vs. .49; Raven Colored Progressive Matrices: .07 vs. .31). Shipman interpreted these findings as reflecting "the more narrow range of expectations in the black sample and the greater positive change in the white mother's expectations for their child's educational attainment" (B, 14, 22).

In keeping with the transactional perspective used in the ETS study, Shipman also addressed the role of change in parental expectations over time. She found that maternal expectations and aspirations for their children's educational achievement were not stable over time, but were generally significantly higher in the sixth year of the study than they were in the first year of the study. The power of maternal expectations was shown to be especially strong, however, when the data were analyzed by part correlations. Mothers who raised their expectations over time tended to have children who achieved at high levels. When expectation scores for the first year of the study and the sixth year of the study were considered simultaneously in a multiple regression equation, the two sets of expectations were found to account for about 30% of the variance in third-grade mathematics achievement.

One implication is that interventions aimed at improving child outcome may be effective at several points in the child's development, and need not be introduced only early in the child's life.

Parke's study proposed to examine the influence of changes in father's attitudes and behavior patterns on father-infant and mother-infant dyadic interactions. Preliminary analyses indicated that the father's sex role attitudes and knowledge about infants' needs could be changed by a film intervention developed for this study. Viewing the film was also found to produce changes in father-infant interaction, including increases in the fathers' vocalizations, imitation of infant vocalization, and play behavior with the infant, including kissing, tickling, and use of a toy as a tracking object.

Hock also examined parental attitudes; in this case, maternal attitudes as related to caregiving attributes and child outcomes. The relationship of maternal attitudes and caregiving attributes to child behavior or outcomes was problematical in this study, however, because attitudes were related to career orientation and career orientation was correlated significantly with the mother's actual work status. Infants of mothers displaying the different attitudes described in the study, therefore, most probably received different forms of child care (due to mother's work status), which may have influenced child outcomes.

Parents' relations with extrafamilial institutions. Parental mediation between environmental variables and child functioning was examined in two studies.

Greenberg proposed to examine parental mediation of children's social learning from television. Of particular interest were children's social role attitudes, pro-social behavior, and anti-social behavior. The model used in the study included mediation by family variables related to structure, status, and interaction patterns, as well as children's personal characteristics. The primary theoretical formulation of the model was social learning theory, focused on one-way effects. While Greenberg recognized the modification of direct learning effects by the children's needs and attitudes, or parental interpretations and evaluations, his hypotheses were causal rather than interactive.

The methodology used in Greenberg's study focused primarily on field surveys aimed at assessing children's behavior and attitudes. The methodology and the analyses unfortunately did not allow inferences regarding other important variables suggested by the model. .Family communication and interaction around television programs would seem especially important, perhaps warranting a more limited study in which interaction is measured directly through behavior observation or other techniques. One phase of Greenberg's study dealt with the experimental manipulation of both parental guidance in program selection and children's decision-making strategies in selecting programs. Both investigations, while not yet completed, are potentially important for intervention in this area.

Some of Hock's findings involved the way children's relationships to other people are mediated by mothers' work status and mothers' attitudes about their relationships to their children. The more mothers perceived their role to be that of exclusive caretakers of their children at 3 and 8 months, the more intensity of resistance to a stranger the infant displayed in an experimental situation at one year. This perception was not related to the infants' behavior toward their mothers. Similar and congruent findings were noted for career orientation and for work status. The greater the mothers' career orientation at 3 and 8 months, the more intensity of affiliative bheavior to the stranger was shown by the infant at one year. For work status, infants of nonworking mothers showed more resistance to the stranger while, again, no differences were found in behavior toward mothers. Thus nonworking, non-career-oriented mothers who saw their role as that of exclusive infant caretakers had infants who showed more resistance to strangers.

Work status and several maternal attitudes tended to form a fairly congruent cluster in Hock's study. Work status was highly correlated with career orientation, and career orientation was found to be a stable predisposition. Some attitudes concerning maternal role were also related to work status. Working mothers did not express feelings of anxiety about leaving their infants, did not perceive infant distress as being caused by their leaving, and did not doubt the competence of other caregivers. Attitudes toward maternal role, however, had lower test-retest correlations than did career orientation, suggesting perhaps that attitudes are more responsive to other variables such as infant traits and changing infant needs and are, to a degree, independent of mothers' longstanding career predispositions.

While the work status and attitudes of mothers seem to form a cluster of variables that influenced children's responses to other people, it is possible that factors related to work-status--especially type of care experienced by children--might also be influential. This is suggested by Hock's analysis of a subsample of infants in group care versus infants in individual care outside of the home. Infants in group care showed more intense resistive behavior to both their mothers and strangers than did other infants. Hock noted that "a more in-depth examination [of these behaviors] reveals that this category is indicative of an angry, petulant mood [in which the infant] is unable to effectively communicate his need or to accept contact from the adult" (A, XIII, 1, 124). In addition, interactions were found between the type of care and sex of the child.

Confidence in the findings to date. The confidence that can be placed in the findings of the studies examined in this section is mixed. Shipman's study stands out as exemplary in its theoretical construction, methodological care, and appropriate use of relevant and sophisticated analytical techniques. It must be borne in mind, however, that most of the ACYF studies were significantly smaller than Shipman's and were undertaken as explorations into fields of relatively new inquiry; their findings were intended in many instances to be suggestive of new hypotheses and program directions for subsequent investigation and demonstration.

In general, this group of ACYF studies is strong in its frequent adoption of a transactional theoretical perspective. As a group, the studies are attempting to examine processes that underlie status factors frequently associated with particular categories of child outcomes. In this respect, many of them withstand well any criticism that they propose to examine simple phenomena or seek simple answers to questions about complex intrafamily relationships. An interactional perspective is particularly well-defined and prominent in Shipman's, Parke's, and Padilla's studies; it is evident in at least some respects in all other studies examined in this section.

Some of the studies are strong on other grounds as well. The use of multiple measures to elicit different aspects of the same factor or interaction is integral to the Shipman, Parke, Bell, and Hardy studies and increases greatly the level of confidence that may be placed in their findings. Parke's combination of interactional and molecular methods likely will add noteworthy strength to his study when it is completed. Padilla's and Nobles's use of a direct measure of family interaction (tape and video recordings of actual interactions) rather than reliance on verbal or written reports of interactions is likely also to add considerable strength to their findings. Goldberg's care both in selecting an unbiased sample and in establishing inter-rater reliability on instrumentation similarly enhance the level of confidence that may be placed in her forthcoming findings. Appropriate and sophisticated data analyses are clearly a source of strength in Shipman's findings, and will be so in Parke's study if his proposed data analysis plans are realized.

Just as the studies reflect a number of strengths, so are there some potential weaknesses that detract from the confidence which may be placed in the findings. Although the purposes of some studies were clearly exploratory, inattention to testable hypotheses and random selection of subjects, for example, compromised the strength of even exploratory findings. Some studies suffered from inadequate controls and the confounding of two or more potentially important variables. In other instances, the strength of findings was compromised by inadequate attention to specific means of analyzing data once they had been gathered; Nobles's study, for example, made good use of videotape technology in filming family discussions, but his use of the technology was compromised by the absence of clear categories for analysis. Some of the strength of Padilla's study, similarly, is in doubt pending adequate definition of the units of analysis to be employed in interpreting the data. In some instances, too, studies were weakened by the use of inadequate means to examine the question being asked; Greenberg, for example, asked questions related to family interactions around television programming but concentrated on a content analysis of the programs rather than an analysis of family interaction.

One final area of concern related to confidence involves the use of project-developed instruments. All of the studies examined in this section used unique, project-developed measures. This can be a strength, as, for example, when a project-developed instrument allows targeting on a particular variable that previously has been examined inadequately. A case in point is the Goldberg study, in which one objective was to develop measures of parental attachment to use in identifying potential caretaking casuality. In this sense, the use of project-developed instruments may be seen as a necessary outgrowth of methodological changes engendered by an emerging transactional perspective on child and family development. Yet, there are problems in the use of idiosyncratic project-developed instruments: inadequate theoretical rationales, inattention to specific use of the data once gathered, and inadequate work on reliability and validity. If project-developed instruments are to enhance the strength of findings, it would seem imperative that the following accompany their use. First, necessary time and funding must be allocated for adequate assessment of the reliability and validity of each project-developed instrument. Shipman's work is exemplary in this respect. Second, the use of project-developed instruments must be accompanied by the complementary use of more widely-used instruments with recognized reliability. The Shipman, Parke, and Bell studies followed this procedure. Third, some effort should be made to use project-developed instruments that have established preliminary reliability and validity in other projects focused on the same variables. Parke's use of the Parent Diary Record, also employed by Goldberg (based on work by Richards and Bernal), is a good example of the sharing of project-developed instruments.

In sum, the confidence that can be placed in the findings of this group of ACYF studies is mixed but promising. Following the lead of studies that show clear methodological and analytic strength, it should be possible to increase markedly the level of confidence in the findings of studies in the next round of ACYF family research projects.

Promising Hypotheses and Program Implications

Several promising hypotheses and program implications emerge from this portion of ACYF's family research program.

1. A number of the studies considered in this section centered not on intervention to replace family functioning but on examining

families as they meet developmental demands and cope with stress; this is clearly a theme that deserves continued emphasis. What are the strengths that exist in the "natural" environment that families use and develop in coping with developmental tasks and stresses? Attention should also be given to the stresses experienced by families and their perceptions of their ability to cope with such stress. What resources are available and what ones are used in the rearing and socialization of children? Programming should assess strengths existing in the natural environment and function to support strengths available in the family and other primary groups. Attention should be given also to targeting programs on times of greater or extraordinary stress in families (e.g., divorce and major illness).

2. Examination of a variety of processes within status factors should continue also. What, for example, is the nature of family stability during the early years of a child's life, within status factors? What goals do parents set for their children? How do these goals develop and how do parents set about accomplishing them? As Shipman's findings imply, status variables "may be irrelevant as functional indicators for purposes of educational design and planning" (B, 14, 175). While status variables may continue to remain important as gross indicators of research and programming needs, major attention should be given to processes that are relevant to child-rearing and socialization and to interactions between status and process variables.

3. The effects and development of expectations should also receive further research and programming attention. How do parental expectations develop and interact with a child's growth? Why do expectations play such a strong role, as found by Shipman, in children's educational achievement? What are the interactions between child characteristics, parental characteristics, and the impact of parental expectations? Shipman's findings, among others, indicate the potential power of expectations; programming attention should be given to ways of supporting positive, appropriate parental expectations for children's development and achievement.

4. The contribution and interaction of family members as related to child outcomes warrants additional study. How does the presence of siblings and other extended family members affect developmental outcomes for children? How do parental interactions with siblings influence child outcomes? Such examinations should include explicit consideration of family developmental level as well as children's developmental levels; continued attention should be given also to the ways in which individual characteristics and resources impact on the family as a unit and the individuals within the family.

5. Further attention to family member relations with external institutions is needed also. The ways in which other socializing agents (e.g., school, peers) interact with the family in affecting

children's school performance is an important area of study that has grown out of Shipman's findings.

6. The role of parents as mediators should be examined further. How do parent relationships with various aspects of the environment influence family interactions? What is the impact on themselves and their children, for example, of parents' attitudes toward work?

This portion of the ACYF family research program, much of which was intended to be exploratory and descriptive, has joined with other efforts in the field to produce a wealth of potentially promising research and program directions. The time is now ripe for the selection of specific areas of interest and the accomplishment of carefully constructed research and program efforts.

Interventions into Individual and Family Development

Research on the development of children and the role of families and other environmental forces in that development has generally persuaded policymakers, professionals, and citizens, alike, that the judicious support or alteration of naturally occurring developmental processes can produce useful effects. In certain instances, as with "unlucky children" (Steiner, 1976), these interventions, especially during the earliest years of life, are sometimes even thought to be absolutely necessary for adequate development to occur.

History of Research

During the 1960s a great deal of psychological and educational research was focused on the development of early intellectual functioning. Much of this interest was inspired by Hunt's (1961) treatise on the role of early experience in the development of intelligence and Bloom's (1964) thesis that a very significant proportion of human intellectual capacity is developed during the early childhood years. Further inspiration came from the encouraging results of the early childhood intervention research programs of Gray and Klaus (1965) and Weikart, Kamii, and Radin (1964). This early evidence of the ability to increase the intellectual functioning of low-income children stimulated special educators and educational psychologists to develop programmatic procedures for delivering early educational services to children who were predicted to be at developmental and academic risk, presumably because of the social and economic disadvantage of their families.

Gray and Klaus, and Weikart et al. demonstrated that center-based early education programs with a home-visiting component involving teacher, mother, and child can increase intellectual functioning as measured by standardized intelligence tests. They were followed by others (e.g., Bereiter & Englemann, 1966; Gordon, 1967; Levenstein & Sunley, 1968; Schaefer, 1968) who also sought to demonstrate that measured intellectual functioning of preschool children can be improved to make successful school performance more probable. By the late sixties Weikart (cited by Karnes, 1969) asserted that an emerging research emphasis was on the relative effectiveness of definably different intervention approaches, rather than on the mere ability to demonstrate that any intervention is better than none. The objective during the late 1960s and early 1970s was to identify the critical variables that produced program effectiveness. Some of the variables examined were age of the child during the intervention period (Karnes, 1969; Schaefer & Aaronson, 1972), type of intervention agent (Madden, Levenstein, & Levenstein, 1976), and type of curriculum (Karnes, 1969; Weikart, 1969). It is important to note that the measures used to determine program effectiveness almost always included, and generally emphasized, intellectual growth.

While early childhood intervention research projects were being conducted by the research community, Project Head Start was being developed and operated within local communities as a comprehensive intervention service program for the enhancement of early development. Although Head Start had broader health, nutritional, and social goals than did typical intervention research efforts, it was similar to those efforts in attempting to improve the intellectual functioning and learning skills of low-income children in order that they might achieve during the school years. The interest of a number of independent researchers in working with the parents of young children as an important aspect of intervention (e.g., Gordon, 1967; Klaus & Gray, 1968; Levenstein & Sunley, 1968; Weikart & Lambie, 1968) was paralleled by a similar interest in many Head Start programs and other federally supported service or research and development efforts (e.g., Parent-Child Centers, Parent-Child Development Centers, Home Start).

We have witnessed major efforts over the last 15 years by the research community and the service program community to improve the intellectual functioning of low-income young children in order to improve subsequent academic performance. A major question, however, continues to be whether early intervention has significant, loug-term, and lasting effects.

The generally encouraging results of nearly a decade of research and evaluation efforts were questioned by Bronfenbrenner (1974) who claimed to have demonstrated that subjects in 12 of the most carefully conducted and evaluated early intervention studies up to that time showed a decline in measured intelligence within two years of leaving the programs, and an even sharper decline after school entry. This was fuel heaped on the fire started by the controversial negative evaluation of Head Start published in 1969 by the Westinghouse Corporation and Ohio University and the equally controversial Jensen (1969) report.

Reviewed in this section are a number of projects funded by ACYF that speak to the question of the effectiveness of early intervention, several of which overcome some of the limitations of the research to date. These are truly important studies for helping to determine the future of early intervention efforts.

A review of the social and political history of early childhood intervention since the 1960s leads to several important considerations. Undoubtedly there are relatively powerful political constituencies in this area—again policymakers, professionals, and citizens, alike—which guarantee that some form of early intervention will continue in the future. Therefore, it has been our approach in this report to (a) review carefully the ACYF research, demonstration, and evaluation efforts, (b) evaluate both the questions posed and the answers offered, (c) "question the question" of early intervention as a panacea for society's ills, (d) realize that early intervention will probably continue to exist despite the nature of evaluation data, although the data are far from indicating its discontinuation, and, finally, (e) propose a shift in emphasis from intervention to support for the purpose of enabling families, with children of all ages, to optimize the development of children, and the development of family units.

ACYF Research Relative to That of Other Agencies

An examination by Hertz (1976) of projects funded in fiscal year 1975 by federal agencies represented on the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development indicated that 47% of ACYF research and demonstration projects were in direct service and intervention areas. Another 28% of the ACYF projects were service and intervention projects focused on child development, family, and broader social environments. Thus, 75% of all ACYF projects have some service or intervention component. Four agencies had a larger proportion of their projects focused on some type of service or intervention (Social and Rehabilitation Service, 100%; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 100%; Office of Education, 99%; and Department of Labor, 83%) while nine agencies had a much smaller proportion with this focus. ACYF led all agencies with 14% of its projects devoted to service and interventions focused on the family while no other agency effort exceeded 5%.

What Is Known And With What Degree of Confidence?

In this analysis the following completed ACYF projects were examined:

Garcia: Preschool Bilingual Research Program (OCD-90-C-262)
Guinagh & Gordon: School Performance as a Function of Early Stimulation (OCD-90-C-638)

Katz: Modification of Children's Racial Attitudes (OCD-CB-151)[4]
Lazar: The Persistence of Preschool Effects: A Long-Term Follow-up of Fourteen Infant and Preschool Experiments (OCD-18-76-07843)
Love: National Home Start Evaluation
Parent-Child Development Center Evaluations
Quigley: The Choctaw Home-Centered Family Education Demonstration Project (OCD-CB-158)
Segal: Home Start: School for Parents (OCD-CB-138)
Silcott: Study of Socio-Economic Status and Racism in a Preschool Program (OCD-CB-449)

Also mentioned are the following ACYF projects for which interim reports or at least some analyzable data were available:

Mathis: Ecological Influences on Psychosocial Development of Black Children (OCD-90-C-259)
McClintock: A Multi-Facet Study of Mexican American Mothers and Children in a Preschool Program (OCD-90-C-620)

One of the fundamental research questions of the 1960s about early intervention concerned its effect on later school performance. The bulk of the published literature, however, addressed only the more immediate effects since many years were required for the children to enter and make progress through the school system. ACYF-supported longitudinal studies by Lazar, Shipman, and Guinagh and Gordon assessed long-term intervention effects, but their results and conclusions do not yield a clear and simple picture.

---

[4] While this study does not relate to families and will not be mentioned further in this report, a brief summary is reported here because of the implications for intervention. Katz's study of modification of racial attitudes demonstrated that attitudes of elementary school children are malleable and that schools can do much more than they are doing now to counteract racial prejudice. Using an experimental design, Katz found that two of the four experimental conditions were promising in modifying racial attitudes as measured by The Katz-Zalk Projective Prejudice Test, The Koslin Social Distance Scale, and The Friendship Test. The Friendship Test, however, was the least subject to change. These techniques were perceptual differentiation (increased individuation of black faces) and vicarious contact (involvement in black stories). The perceptual differentiation condition was most effective in reducing social distance at the two-week posttest and was still effective after 4 months. The effect was more pronounced for younger participants (second grade students) than for older (fifth grade students). These findings suggest that racial prejudice might be combatted through early intervention programs. Since the treatment in each condition required only 15 minutes time, these results seem quite remarkable.

The Lazar-directed study was a collaborative effort of 12 principal investigators (the Consortium on Developmental Continuity) representing 14 infant or preschool intervention projects begun during the 1960s. The objective was to determine the effects of early intervention on later school performance. Follow-up procedures included retesting and interviewing of former participants, gathering data from school records, and interviewing parents. More than 1,900 of the original experimental and control subjects, ranging from 9 to 18 years of age, were located. Major child-outcome measures included standardized individually administered intelligence tests, school achievement tests, data on special education placement, and data on grade retention.

Data analyses are still in progress. An early report (October, 1977) presented the following results based on pooled data from about half the projects in the Consortium: (a) early intervention had a significant effect on measured intelligence that lasted throughout a meaningful number of the elementary school grades; (b) although these IQ effects lasted for at least 3 years after the end of intervention, the effects were not permanent; (c) the low-income children in the experimental group met the minimum school requirements significantly more often than control children by virtue of a lower incidence of special education placement and a lower incidence of retention in grade.

Several caveats are in order regarding these most important findings: (a) data were not available from all the projects in the Consortium; (b) data were pooled across a quite varied array of program operational dates, geographic regions, types of subjects, and intervention approaches--proponents of one school of thought would argue that this is a major strength of the study, while others would question the researcher's ability to interpret the independent variables derived from such pooling; (c) dependent variables were narrowly restricted to the academic domain, a limitation readily acknowledged by Lazar; and (d) generalizability was limited because the projects in the study were probably among the most carefully and competently planned and conducted programs in the field. Lazar was well aware of this last point when he cautiously concluded, "well-run early education programs can in some way improve the ability of low-income children to meet the requirements of their schools" (A, XVII, 1, 109, emphasis added).

At seeming variance with the Lazar findings is the finding from the ETS longitudinal study presented earlier of the effects at age 9 of Head Start attendance at age 4. Stated briefly, Shipman found that children who did and did not attend Head Start did not differ significantly on any characteristics measured at age 9. Based on the Consortium's results, Lazar has recommended that Head Start programs be reviewed to determine the extent to which structured curricula are being used in the service of specific learning goals and teaching strategies. Most of the Lazar data came from highly controlled and research-oriented non-Head Start programs, and these approaches undoubtedly contrasted with the Head Start programs involved in the ETS study. The probable contrast in degree of curricular structure may help explain the discrepant findings. Further, Shipman wisely cautioned that, due to the limited sample of Head Start programs her subjects attended, her Head Start findings should not be generalized to all of Head Start.

Further support for long-term effectiveness of early childhood intervention was found in Guinagh and Gordon's longitudinal study (Gordon is a member of the Consortium on Developmental Continuity), which examined the school performance of former participants in the Florida Parent Education Program. The program began in 1966 working with low-income mothers of 3-month-old children. In an earlier longitudinal follow-up study, Gordon and Guinagh (1974) found significantly higher Stanford-Binet performance for experimental than for control children at least 3 years after children left the project. In the current study, Guinagh and Gordon went beyond the narrow criterion of measured intelligence to perform an ecological assessment of school performance involving achievement tests, examination of school records, assignment to special education, referral for discipline problems, teacher judgments on need for psychological help, retention in grade, and teacher evaluation of classroom adjustment measured by the Classroom Behavior Inventory. The Teacher Report of Parent Behavior was used to measure parental behavior related to children's school performance. Data were gathered for up to 6 years subsequent to program termination. The longitudinal experimental group, which consisted of families who were in the program for 2 or more consecutive years, scored significantly higher than the control group on school achievement tests, while there was a similar but nonsignificant trend for the Home Learning Center group, which consisted of families who were in the program for the third year only. Significantly fewer experimental than control children were assigned to special education. No significant differences were found on any of the other measures.

Guinagh and Gordon reported that "hard" data (achievement test scores and school assignment) indicate that

> there are clear lasting school achievement and performance effects for children who were in the parent education program with their parents for two or three consecutive years ending when they were two or three years old. This effect has lasted up to six years after the end of the program. It is demonstrated both in achievement test scores and assignment to special education. The results are less profound for those who were in the program for only one year from age two to three. The effect is demonstrated somewhat in school assignment, but is not clear-cut in achievement test scores. (A, XI, 1, 44-45)

In contrast, "soft" data, such as teacher ratings and parent reports, did not reveal long-term effects. Differences in results as assessed by "hard" and "soft" measures suggest the need for further development and refinement of instrumentation. Even though Guinagh and Gordon used some of the best available instruments, many of them were psychometrically weak. More systematically developed multi-method procedures (e.g., behavioral observation in home and school, psychometric assessment of a broad band of child behavior patterns, and parent interviews) would have strengthened all of the intervention research reported in this section. Instrument development continues to be a priority for research in the intervention field.

Guinagh and Gordon were able to conclude from their results that the involvement of mothers can be a highly effective intervention strategy, and they recommended the further involvement of fathers. Bronfenbrenner (1974) also provided evidence for the critical importance of parental involvement in early intervention geared to the developmental needs of families and children. ACYF programs in this area include Home Start and Parent-Child Development Centers.

Home Start was designed to support existing family strengths. One objective of the program was to demonstrate an alternative to the Head Start model in order to broaden the intervention program options available to communities. In addition to providing the range of health and social services offered by Head Start, Home Start had paraprofessionals make home visits to low-income, mostly rural, families to help enhance parenting skills. The evaluation component was broad based in measurement, had both formative and summative aspects, included control groups to test program effectiveness, and also involved comparisons between Head Start and Home Start programs.

For purposes of this report, the best presentation of findings and implications from the Home Start evaluation are the summary statements from the final report (A, XVIII, 1):

> On a number of dimensions at both 7 and 12 months, Home Start produced significant changes in parents compared to the control group. (p. 14)
>
> When tested after 7 months and again after 12 months of program involvement, Home Start children were found to differ significantly from the control children in several aspects of their growth and development. (p. 14)
>
> There were very few differences in outcomes for children and mothers who participated for two years and those who participated for one year. (p. 15)
>
> When [the parents] in the two groups were compared after 7, 12, and 20 months of program involvement, there were some differences favoring Head Start and some favoring Home Start, for

most variables, however, there were no differences in the effects of the two programs. (p. 16)

Since the costs per child of Home Start were equal to or slightly less than the costs of Head Start and since the programs had essentially comparable effects, Home Start was a cost-effective use of public funds relative to Head Start. (p. 17)

There was little evidence that the greater costs of longer family enrollment resulted in greater benefits to children or parents. (p. 18)

Services received varied considerably from family to family. (p. 19)

Across-site variations were found in family enrollment and per family costs. (p. 19)

The number of specialists employed in various service areas varied considerably across projects and affected program costs. (p. 20)

Projects were successful in obtaining a considerable amount of resources from community sources. (p. 20)

Home visitors were paid low salaries for the professional work they did. (p. 20)

Home visit focus on parents increased over the course of the demonstration project. (p. 21)

Home Start was partially successful in involving other family members in program activities. (p. 21)

Supervision provided to home visitors was not completely adequate. (p. 22)

A considerable number of referrals were made to help meet family needs. (p. 22)

Home visitors working with more than 13 families had difficulty maintaining frequent and regular contact with families. (p. 23)

Home visitors with children made fewer home visits than those with no children at home. (p. 23)

Home visitor age and the length of time she had been employed by the project affected home visit focus and content. (p. 23)

Specialists did not have an impact on the length of time spent on specific content areas during home visits. (p. 24)

The amount of home visit time spent on a particular component was not associated with positive parent and child outcomes. (p. 24)

Home visit frequency was affected by program location and focal child age. (p. 24)

Variations in the frequency and duration of home visits had an effect on parent and child outcomes. (p. 25)

Love was appropriately cautious about interpretations of this provocative body of findings. Caveats mentioned concerning generalizability of findings were: (a) the special attention that was given to this relatively small demonstration project that makes generalization to future large-scale service programs very tentative, (b) the specific nature of this particular home-based intervention, the results of which may not generalize to other approaches, and (c) the special nature of the sample of project sites, which may not be representative of communities across the country. Given these cautions, the following implications were drawn from the findings:

Paraprofessionals can be effective providers of Home Start services. (p. 27)

Three features of program operations--training, supervision, and the use of specialists--deserve special attention. (p. 28)

Efficiency in operation can be achieved by controlling the number of families served. (p. 28)

The typical school year (September-June) may represent the optimal program duration. (p. 29)

And regarding implications for future federal demonstration efforts:

The evaluation should begin simultaneously with, if not before, implementation of the demonstration program. (p. 30)

Both process and impact data must be collected for a meaningful assessment of the total project. (p. 30)

A careful cost analysis is essential if findings are to be applicable to future programs. (p. 30)

> Random assignment of eligible participants to program and control groups adds considerable power to the design and is feasible under certain conditions. (p. 31)
>
> A sample of projects can provide meaningful evaluation data so long as information is obtained on the generalizability of findings. (p. 31)
>
> The funding level of demonstration projects should be adjusted to regional variations in the cost-of-living index. (p. 31)

In all, the Home Start demonstration project is one of the few extant cases of a systematic nation-wide early childhood intervention effort that produced straightforward and useful information for future decision-making.

ACYF's Parent-Child Development Center (PCDC) project is a systematic longitudinal approach to early childhood intervention research and program development. Probably better described as an adult education effort, the PCDC Project was originally a part of the Office of Economic Opportunity's attempt to formulate, develop, test, and package replicable program models. The three original PCDC models (in Birmingham, Houston, and New Orleans) have focused on infant intervention by means of parent education in order to enhance parent competence and prevent developmental problems due to socioeconomically-related environmental conditions. The first phase of the PCDC project has been completed in that the three models have been developed from a synthesis of research and theory-congruent practice and subjected to comprehensive evaluation. The second phase, which is a controlled replication experiment, is currently in process in the three original sites and in three replication sites (Indianapolis, San Antonio, and Detroit), coordinated by a new institutional form, the replication management organization, in this case, the Bank Street College of Education.

An important feature of this relatively large-scale program has been its research strategy. Exemplary features have included: a research and program planning period, the use of broad-based outcome measures, a formative evaluation component, a summative evaluation design that was a true experiment with random assignment to experimental and control groups, and the inclusion of replication and dissemination considerations at every phase of the program.

Although the three original PCDC models share a common set of general goals and assumptions, each has developed its own approach to fit the needs and circumstances of its particular community of low-income families with children below 3 years of age. The Birmingham program serves a biracial population and has used a sophisticated systems theory model to develop mother-to-mother and mother-to-child interactions.

Houston's program was developed to meet the particular needs and values of its bicultural and bilingual Mexican-American community. In New Orleans, inner-city black families are served and there is evidence for success of a "chain-of-effects" model of program-to-mother, mother-to-mother-to-child interaction, and mother-child interaction-to-child processes. The hallmark of each project is rigorous research and evaluation with responsiveness and sensitivity to program participants.

Each PCDC claims that it was successful in reaching its goals, success that was replicated and continues to be evident some time after families have left the program. There continue to be statistical problems, now being addressed, in analyzing some of the results. However, significant differences or trends between randomly assigned experimental and control groups were found in the development of mothers' attitudes, knowledge, beliefs, and skills both as adult individuals and as parents. Differences were also found in mother-infant interactions and on a variety of cognitive and social child outcomes at 36 months of age. Mother and child program effects have persisted beyond program termination to at least 48 months of age. A summary report of the three projects indicates consistency of results across sites and a uniform enthusiasm and commitment of longstanding program participants. An important finding in New Orleans was the initial demonstration and subsequent replication of a clear-cut "chain-of-effects" phenomenon in which measured program effects on mothers preceded measured effects on children. This finding was predicted from the intervention theory that guided the New Orleans people in their attempt to create positive mother changes that would have a causal relationship to subsequent positive child outcomes. (It should be noted that Kessen and Fein, 1975, failed to find a predicted "chain-of-effects" phenomenon in a recent mother-infant home visiting study.)

To date, the PCDC project has been important because (a) it pursued a systematic longitudinal research approach aimed at eventual replication that is producing useful information on program effectiveness, and (b) it demonstrated the utility of providing family support by delivering service through participating families. As with all extant early childhood intervention projects, however, the project findings would have been strengthened by improved instrumentation and data analysis methods. For example, the New Orleans researchers used a carefully selected battery of outcome measures, but they admitted to significant weakness in the ability to assess maternal attitudes and beliefs. Further, the projects were forced to use a technology of mother-child interaction assessment that was in its fledgling stages of development. There were also difficult statistical problems, such as the need to use different measures across time to assess the developing child and the need to deal with the necessarily large and intensive battery of outcome measures relative to the necessarily small number of subjects in costly field research programs. At the programmatic level, potential difficulties regarding wide-scale program operation are the large amount of time required of mothers (which may preclude program participation by many families) and the possibly related problem of attrition. In regard to attrition and program commitment, we agree with Kessen and Fein (1975) that research is called for on these always present but unstudied aspects of intervention.

Although the results reported to this point may be construed as giving strong, yet qualified, support to the effectivenss of early childhood intervention, they also give rise to questions and issues that suggest the need for rethinking this research area. In rephrasing or restructuring the issue of early intervention effectiveness it is helpful to ask: effective for what? Bronfenbrenner's (1974) survey of early intervention is instructive in formulating this question so it can be operationalized. He found that some strategies were more effective than others and that certain factors predicted program success beyond the nature of particular programs. These factors typically involved family living conditions such as (a) the employment status of the family breadwinner, (b) the level of family income, (c) the number of children per room in a household, (d) the presence in the home of an adult other than the primary caregiver, and (e) the education level of the parents. These findings led Bronfenbrenner to emphasize the need for an ecological perspective that has potential for broadening our view of intervention in order to enhance family development and to strengthen society. What is necessary is to construe early intervention within the total ecology of human development, to explore many levels of these variables, and to approach the task with a transactional framework.

Several ACYF-supported researchers have recognized the complexity of variables operating in the ecology of human development. Although there is still a tendency to focus on the development of children, the importance of the parents' development has been emphasized in certain projects (McClintock, Segal). In other projects the transition between family and school by members of bilingual or bicultural groups has been studied (Garcia, McClintock, Mathis, Quigley, Silcott). There is a definite movement on the part of these researchers toward an ecological perspective. Unfortunately, projects are only now in their final stages and the data are incomplete, but the conceptualizations were often of sufficient importance that several of the incomplete projects are presented here.

Segal attempted to involve both parents of young infants in a parent education program. Although the results were inconclusive and were not interpretable unambiguously, a booklet for parents on early child development and perspectives for the use of television in parent education did emerge from the project.

The goal of the Choctaw Family Education Project (Quigley) was to demonstrate how indigenous native Americans using a home-visiting approach based on the one developed at Peabody College's Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education (DARCEE), could work with families having young children. Problems with data collection and research design made the results difficult to interpret. The project's strengths are its recognition of the importance of community and family members beyond the mother in the ecology of human development, and its attempt to capitalize on these resources in culturally meaningful ways.

Two ACYF-supported projects (Garcia, McClintock), focused on the ways in which preschool experiences involving both mothers and children of bilingual Mexican-American families might affect the children's transition between home and school. Garcia found evidence of significantly enhanced language development in both English and Spanish in children whose mothers spoke both languages to their children as compared to mothers who were predominantly monolingual with their children. McClintock's interim findings were consistent with Garcia's findings and indicated further that when children who were supported in their acquisition of both Spanish and English in the preschool setting entered school, their school adjustment and achievement were better than that of children who attended English-oriented preschools or no preschools at all. Important in McClintock's work was the recognition of the power of involving the mothers in the preschool experience explicitly to give them experiences in social institutions that would make them more effective in subsequent transactions with the schools.

Complementing the Garcia and McClintock work in Mexican-American communities are two ACYF-supported studies (Mathis, Silcott) on preschool experiences as a vehicle for affecting the transition between the black community and the school. Mathis used an ecological approach that considered family and neighborhood variables as influential in the children's development. While the data were still in the process of being analyzed at the time of our report, two promising aspects of the project were apparent: (a) the recognition of the need for identifying and measuring family and neighborhood variables that are more discrete than income and occupational status and (b) the development of a preschool curriculum designed specifically to facilitate the transition of the black child into the dominant society. Silcott studied the effects of preschool cultural emphasis (black or white) and SES levels on cognitive performance and the developent of self-esteem in black children. Problems with data collection, representativeness of sampling, high attrition rates, and instrumentation of the self-esteem measure weakened the study. Tentative findings include: (a) black children in predominantly middle-class preschools showed significantly more conceptual growth than children in predominantly lower-class preschools and (b) preschools with a black cultural emphasis and a mixed racial composition enhanced cognitive development of black children compared to preschools with a white cultural emphasis and a mixed racial composition.

Over the last 10 to 15 years, the focus in preschool intervention projects had broadened gradually from relatively exclusive consideration of the child to consideration and involvement of the parents, and now, especially evident in ACYF-supported research, to consideration of a broader set of family, neighborhood, and community factors. There has also been a tendency to extend the temporal focus beyond the first five years of life. Sources beyond the ACYF-projects support the wisdom of these enlarging perspectives.

Karnes (1969) compared five different curricular approaches to preschool programming for low-income children. She worked in collaboration with psychologists and sociologists toward the objectives of (a) the design of effective educational approaches and (b) the determination of the underlying factors that influence intellectual development. In pursuit of this second objective, Farber, Harvey, and Lewis (1969) found that variables extraneous to specific programs had more influence on children's performance than program variables. Farber et al. studied the kinship organization of the families with children enrolled in the several preschool programs in the Karnes study. According to Farber's (1971) report of findings, individual kinship organization systems affected children's developing competence by means of socialization practices that were consistent with their norms. He maintained that the fit or lack of fit between a particular kinship pattern and the political, economic, and educational systems of modern American society influenced the functioning of families, the intellectual competence of their preschool children, and the ability of the children to profit from educational programs. This sociological approach is a useful corrective for the typically narrow perspective of psychologists and educators.

A more recent study by Kessen and Fein (1975) also supports the use of a broadened perspective in early childhood intervention. Three different curricular approaches to home visiting with mothers and infants were compared. Of particular interest here is the finding that independent of social class, families with extensive kin relations or expanded households (i.e., households with adult caregivers in addition to the mother but not including the father) were far more responsive to the home-visiting programs than were families with restricted social ties. Kessen and Fein emphasized the need for interventionists to recognize the significant but often overlooked role that families as well-formed and established structures play in the development of mother-child interactions,and in the accessibility of families to influence by extra-familial institutions. Fein (1978) urged:

> When we design educational programs, and especially when we design evaluations of these programs, we do well to take into account that field of events from which and in response to which children develop. For some program objectives, the age of the child is crucial; for other objectives the life style of the family must be taken

> into account. The cost of neglecting these issues is an inflated image of success and a deflated image of failure. (p. 10)

The emerging awareness that we must broaden our perspective in intervention research and programming should be coupled with the recognition that intervention and support systems must be made available beyond the early childhood years (e.g., see Smith, 1968). Clarke and Clarke (1976) have concluded from an extensive survey of intervention research efforts that:

> First and foremost, the whole of development is important, not merely the early years. There is as yet no indication that a given stage is clearly more formative than others; in the long-term all may be important. We are now entering the era when empirical findings, based upon the newer and more powerful methodologies of the behavioral sciences, have the possibility of dictating appropriate policies . . . . The widespread use of over-simple notions about children, of inadequate social action dependent on such notions, and the unwitting employment of self-fulfilling prophecies, need to give way to imaginative, yet independently and austerely evaluated experiments which depend only on the assumption that what one does for a child at any age, provided it is maintained, plays a part in shaping his development within the limits imposed by genetic and constitutional factors. (p. 273)

Taking together Bronfenbrenner's (1974) perspective on the ecology of human development, the evidence issuing from the emerging research emphasis in the ACYF family research program, Farber's (1971) sociological perspective, the Kessen and Fein (1975) findings and caveats, and the Clarke and Clarke (1976) assertions. we are led inescapably to two conclusions. First, initial early childhood intervention conceptions were too narrow and are being replaced by more comprehensive approaches, many of which underscore the need to recognize and support the naturally occurring resources in the ecology of human development. Second, as Schaefer (1970) suggested several years ago, there is need for attention to be paid to both early and continuing aspects of human development.

Confidence in the findings to date. Although we have come a long way in the area of early childhood intervention research, the degree of confidence in the data base is not as high as most people would wish it to be. Granted that this research area is relatively new and that the inevitable vagaries of the field must be considered, it is nonetheless the case that the state of the art is characterized by high attrition rates, insufficient sample sizes, insufficient number of replicated findings, inadequate control groups, and a lack of longitudinal data (cf. Stedman, Anastasiow, Dokecki, Gordon, & Parker, 1972). These are general problems that need to be recognized and addressed by individual investigators and funding agencies. Can intervention research methods be tolerated that are grossly inadequate? The scientific adequacy of the funded work must be improved.

A more specific problem that continues to demand immediate attention (cf. Sparling & Gallagher, 1971, who made this point to OCD several years ago) is the need to develop, improve, and refine instrumentation in the affective and social domains. Although costly in time and money, and not usually productive of immediate pay-off, such work would have the twofold benefit of (a) allowing researchers to assess more sensitively the intervention effects they are capable of producing and (b) encouraging researchers to expand their intervention objectives beyond the more easily measured cognitive domain. Promising approaches here include those of Baumrind (1973) and Kessen and Fein (1975).

Promising Hypotheses and Program Implications

The analyses presented in this section support the use of a research framework including (a) a broadly conceived ecological perspective on human development that emphasizes the transactions between persons and environments, (b) an emphasis on the key role of families in the enhancement of human development and the influence of institutional and other environmental factors on that role; and (c) an assertion that all families need various types of support throughout the cycle of individual and family development. There is need both to finish answering persistent old questions and to begin asking new questions within this framework.

1. Future research and demonstration efforts might profitably:
    a. support families in their diverse forms, recognizing that some family situations allow parents to remain in the home, while others require parents to be away;
    b. focus on both family and child development and go beyond exclusive concern with the cognitive domain to consideration of affective and social development;
    c. avoid exclusive concern with the first three or the first five years of life and recognize the need for both early and continuing intervention;
    d. capitalize on existing neighborhood and community mediating structures and available resources;
    e. use a research and development strategy wherein time and money are available for theory development, use of the research knowledge base, adaptation to local conditions, careful development and evaluation of

program elements, summative evaluation over several program waves, development of curriculum and staff training programs, and careful field testing and replication.

2. Beyond the variables and processes usually involved in early intervention projects, there is need to identify variables in the natural ecology of the child and family that relate to human development. This recommended shift in research emphasis should complement, not preclude, the further conduct of intervention research. Classes of variables of particular promise include household organization, kinship structure and functioning, the family's status and functioning in its neighborhood and community, and adult family members' interactions with societal institutions. It is likely that concentration on these classes of variables will move future intervention programs toward efforts that are more supportive of families.

3. Longitudinal follow-ups of intervention projects and attempts to replicate successful interventions should be undertaken more frequently.

4. Research on the social and affective domains should be expanded, especially regarding instrument development.

5. In pursuit of the goal of a pluralistic society, factors influencing the operation of bicultural or bilingual families should be studied further. Means should be developed of providing opportunities for the acquisition of the characteristics and competencies required by the dominant society, while at the same time preserving the characteristics and competencies valued by the subculture. Of particular importance is the role of naturally occurring support and mediating structures that help families and children transact with societal institutions, such as the schools.

6. Research should be continued in the use of indigenous professionals in the intervention process. Members of local communities can play an important role in providing linkages and mediating between families and service delivery bureaucracies. The most effective ways of training and supervising nonprofessionals have yet to be determined.

7. Research is required on the best means of disseminating the results of intervention research and development efforts (cf. Stedman et al., 1972).

Current research and program efforts in early childhood intervention have yielded promise for emerging hypotheses and for future program efforts. Our recommendations for future research and programming represent a shift from the traditional intervention approach (often based on a deficit model) to a support system approach that recognizes the developmental needs of all families. The emphasis that is given to family developmental needs, rather than exclusive concern with developmental needs of children, represents a shift in theoretical perspective as well as a shift in approach. A family development perspective gives special attention to (a) critical (or transitional) points in the family's developmental life cycle and (b) specific and immediate needs of families in particular crisis situations (e.g., birth of a developmentally delayed child, hospitalization of a family member, divorce, death). A second recommended research and programming shift is from a categorical service approach to a support system approach that offers a variety of services or options to families according to individual needs. This approach not only recognizes a continuum of family styles but it also stresses family autonomy. Our third recommended shift for future research and programming is to integrate mediating structures (e.g., extended kin, paraprofessional community members, church and local community agencies) into the support system approach.

Family-Institution Relationships

Families are society's most important institutions, and they are imbedded in an extensive network of related societal institutions. The institutional type studied most often is the formal bureaucratic organization, a system or group of organizations specifically geared toward a common product or purpose. Examples include health, education, and welfare service delivery systems. A neglected but critically important institutional type is the mediating support structure (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977),[5] a group or organization that helps mediate between the demands of the large bureaucratic structures, on the one hand, and parents, children, and youth, on the other. Examples include the extended family, kinship networks, neighborhoods, churches, voluntary organizations, and other primary support groups.

History of Research

We suggested earlier that the study of family-institutional interactions are the newest and least investigated aspect of ACYF's family research agenda. It is possible, however, to trace several longstanding roots of this research.

One-way effect studies constitute one approach. This research concentrates on (a) families' perceptions of and attitudes toward institutions or (b) the effects upon family life of institutional policies, practices, and procedures viewed from the unilateral perspective of institutional initiatives. Types of formal organizations studied include governmental, legal, religious, educational, social, service, day care, foster care, adoption services, health, economic, employment, and the like.[6] Also included here are studies in which parents are "trained" or "oriented"—projects that imply one-way communication and in which efforts on parents often are viewed as intervening variables related to child outcomes. The majority of research efforts on family-institution relationships throughout this century have been in the one-way effect category (Olson & Dahl, 1977).

---

[5] The concept of mediating structure as formulated by Berger and Neuhaus is quite similar to the concept of "primary groups" as construed by Litwak, Meyer, Sussman and others. We shall use these two concepts interchangeably, aware that some differences do exist between them

A second relatively longstanding research approach includes parent-professional-child interaction studies, often in schools, wherein the interaction between parents and professionals is related to cognitive and affective child variables. This category includes studies which presume that interaction between parents and professionals is two-way.

Linkage studies constitutes a third approach. This research, which has barely moved from a theoretical to an operational plane, deals with transactions between primary groups or mediating structures and bureaucratic operatives. A variety of issues have been explored, such as (a) the characteristics of helping functions that are capable of being performed by indigenous or primary groups (Litwak & Szelenyi, 1969), (b) the relationship between bureaucracies' administrative styles and their linkages with the community (Litwak & Meyer, 1965), (c) the optimal "distance" between primary groups and bureaucracies (Fleming & Sussman, A, XXXV, 4), (d) the ability of bureaucratic structures to accommodate to particular family structures and functions (Cernea, 1975), and (e) the mediating functions of ethnic groups and ethnic agencies (Jenkins, A, XIV, 2). This kind of research began to appear in the early 1950s and has increased in frequency since the 1960s. It has its roots in the sociology of organizations dating back to Max Weber (1947) and, in a somewhat reactive fashion, in the family sociology of Talcott Parsons (1947). A transactional perspective is often used wherein bureaucracies, mediating structures, or primary groups, and families (and children within families) are viewed as unified and holistic systems. Therefore, variables of interest tend to be functional and structural attributes of systems rather than of individuals within systems (Cernea, 1975; Litwak, 1959). Sociology has been the most active discipline in this research, but often in cooperation with other disciplines, especially education (Fleming & Sussman, A, XXXV, 4; Litwak & Meyer, 1965).

---

[6] These subcategories are used by Olson and Dahl in their Family Inventory, 1975-1976, within the larger category of "transactions between families and formal organizations.

Although ACYF has supported research in each of the three categories of family-institution relationships, it seems to be moving, and correctly so in our judgment, to an emphasis on linkage studies.

ACYF Research Relative to That of Other Agencies

ACYF is the leader among the federal agencies participating in the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development in supporting research on family-institution relationships. It is clear from an analysis prepared by the Social Research Groups (SRG) of George Washington University (Hertz, 1976) that ACYF (then OCD) had a relatively higher percentage (18%) of its projects in fiscal year 1975 in this area than any other agency included. Only the Department of Labor and the United States Department of Agriculture had percentages nearly this great (17% and 11% respectively). Less than 8% of the projects of other agencies were in this area. Only eight agencies (including ACYF) had any projects in this area. Moreover, a review of printouts (current through December 1977) from the SRG retrieval system on family research showed that of the 760 listed projects, approximately 60 could be classified in the area of family-institution relationships, and of that number, almost one-third were supported by ACYF.[7]

What Is Known and With What Degree of Confidence?

In this analysis the following completed ACYF studies were examined:

Epstein and McPartland: Over Time Effects and Interactions of Family and School Authority Structures on Child Development (OCD-90-C-904)
Garrett: Effects of Occupational Shift of Family Life Style (OCD-90-C-263)
Jenkins: Ethnic Factors in Child Welfare (OCD-90-C-574)
Nobles: A Formulative and Empirical Study of Black Families (OCD-90-C-901)
Rosser: Study of Family Styles and Interactions with External Institutions (OCD-90-C-258)

Also mentioned are the following ACYF studies for which interim reports, or at least some analyzable data, were available:

---

[7] These 60 studies and the 20 studies conducted under the auspices of ACYF fall into either of our two suggested subareas, parent-professional-child interactions and linkage studies. There are many one-way studies in the retrieval system that we are not including here.

Schaefer: Parent-Professional-Child Interaction and Involvement (OCD-90-C-246)
Sussman and Fleming: Family-School Linkages and Socialization (OCD-90-C-632)
Toledo: Health Education Research and Demonstration Project (OCD-90-C-907)[8]

Both Rosser and Nobles used descriptive, correlational data and their objective was a conceptual reformulation of the structure and functioning of black families. They worked to correct the characterization of the 1960s of the black family as the "center of a tangle of pathology" (Moynihan, 1965). The research is limited by the fact that no comparison groups were used and each sample was drawn from but a single metropolitan area (Washington, D.C., in this study by Rosser and San Francisco, in the study by Nobles). However, it does advance the recent tradition of Billingsley (1968) and Hill (1972) in emphasizing the strengths of black families.

Both studies went beyond a description of internal family structure and attempted to relate intrafamily variables to the use of service institutions by families (Rosser) and family attitudes toward kinship systems and other social institutions (Nobles).

Rosser conducted a linkage study that delineated a "stability in family life" cluster of variables that she claimed was related to successful utilization of agency services. This cluster involved families' perceptions of economic and health security, satisfaction with the physical characteristics of home and neighborhood, home ownership, geographic mobility, frequency and pattern of interaction with kinship networks, marital status, educational level, perceived locus of control, feelings of alienation, and decision-making approaches. Because of unresolved statistical difficulties and threats to external validity, both of which were apparent in the report, the empirical findings were inconclusive, and the relationship between the stability of families and the use of existing services can be viewed only as an hypothesis, albeit a fruitful one, for further research. The potential relationships between agency utilization and kinship (primary group) interaction—a recurring theme in our thinking—and between agency utilization and economic well-being especially deserve greater research effort.

---

[8] Toledo's data were received too late for inclusion in the body of the text. Toledo studied compliance and noncompliance with medical orders among Mexican-American families. When orders were issued for cardiac management in children, including surgery, compliance was found to be related to religious beliefs, previous experiences with health delivery systems, presence of gross symptoms, knowledge of bodily functioning, beliefs in "lay" healing practices, and harmonious family interaction processes. No clear pattern emerged, however, along socioeconomic or demograhpic variables.

In a one-way effect study, Nobles surveyed 60 black families in metropolitan San Francisco in an attempt to understand them as a joint function of their African heritage ("Africanity") and their response to the dominant Euro-American culture. He claimed that by using these two cultural variables, the "pathological" tradition, which asserts that slavery destroyed the African cultural heritage of black families or that black families were structurally weak before their forced migration to the United States, can be reformulated.

Data were collected by black interviewers using open-ended and forced-response questions in 8-hour interview sessions with the entire family. Nobles reported support for the hypothesis that no significant differences exist across educational levels, income levels, migratory experiences, and family development stages for respondents' perceived ethnic identity (African or American), perceived economic and social opportunity within the larger society, perceived meanings of family, and perceived closeness to extended kin systems.

Nobles also found no differences between middle and lower income respondents or those at different stages of the life cycle in claims that economic oppression and racism are the primary factors that prevent them from "making it" in American society. This finding challenges the conventional wisdom that class or income-level within black America is related to perception of economic opportunity. It was also found, independent of socioeconomic status, that black families place high value on the psychological functions of families and on child bearing and child rearing. These findings call into question culture of poverty assumptions as they have been applied frequently to black families. Of particular interest were findings that black families placed high value on kin networks (cf. Bernard, 1966; Billingsley, 1968; Hill, 1972; Stack, 1974). Nobles's provocative interpretation of this finding is that it represents the surviving African heritage with its strong affinity for the tribe as a basic source of survival and meaning.

Nobles's findings are interesting but they must be viewed with caution. In addition to the problems inherent in using a project-developed questionnaire as the primary source of data, the study (as we stated earlier) also employed a geographically restricted sample without a comparison group. Future research of this type requires one or more comparison groups of (a) black families from other regions of the country, (b) black families from rural areas, (c) other ethnic groups that are generally described as "economically oppressed," and (d) other ethnic groups that are thought to place high value on extended family and kin networks. A cross-cultural comparison between urban African families and urban Afro-American families would be particularly instructive.

A major value of the Rosser and Nobles studies is the challenge to prevailing assumptions about black families. With few exceptions, pathology, cultural deprivation, and culture of poverty assumptions have guided the mainstream of the research. Appropriate institutional supports for black and other ethnic and minority families are possible only when guided by an accurate portrayal of the structural and functional integrity of these families.

We digress here to consider aspects of the literature that complement the work of Rosser and Nobles. Robert Hill's (1972) The Strengths of Black Families presented national data from the Census Bureau, Department of Labor, and Office of Economic Opportunity. More instructive than the data was Hill's interpretative framework which assumed the inherent strengths of black families rather than debilitating pathology. For example, 41% of the heads of black households in 1969 with income below poverty level did not work. Do these data reinforce the notion that unemployment, poverty, disillusionment, and alienation proceed in a never-ending cycle for the poor, black families? Or, shouldn't one marvel that 59% of these household heads continue to work despite low salaries, the vagaries of the labor market, and the disincentives to work engendered by Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) and other forms of public assistance? Similarly, the often stated special problem of black families, desertion by male household heads, was shown to be based on "uninformed inferences" (Hill, 1972, p. 27).

In a series of reinterpretations of Office of Economic Opportunity and Department of Labor data, Hill attacked the assertion that black families are matriarchal. Husband and wife income differentials and lack of male employment opportunities have been cited often as conducive to matriarchal patterns. Hill cited Office of Economic Opportunity data, however, showing that 90% of husbands in black families were working as compared to 67% of wives and that, among poor black families, the figures were 70% and 44% for husbands and wives, respectively. Regarding differentials in earning capacity, wives equaled or exceeded their husbands' earnings in only 13% of all black families studied, with a similar percentage evident among the poorest black families (Hill, 1972, p. 14).

As evidence of strong kinship ties, Hill pointed out that 90% of black children born out of wedlock in 1969 were cared for by parents or relatives, while only 7% of similarly born white children were cared for in this way. In addition, there was extensive use of kinship networks in the black community for the informal adoption of children who otherwise would have been sent to child-care institutions (p. 38).

Hill's work strongly challenged stereotypes about black families in five areas: kinship bonds, family roles, work, achievement, and religious orientations. The fact that Hill used national-level data underscores the importance of his work for policymakers and program planners and complements in important ways the work of Rosser, Nobles, and other ACYF-supported researchers.

Carol Stack's (1974) All Our Kin was in the spirit of Billingsley and Hill's conceptual reconstruction of black families. This participant-observation study, possibly the most detailed investigation of the functioning of kin networks in poor black families, also complements the ACYF work discussed in this section.

Stack maintained that kinship networks must be understood as survival-oriented social systems that are highly instrumental in nature and are characterized by transactions that are understood by the members to be reciprocal and mutually obligatory. For example, a person's failure to reciprocate "gifts" or services will, in time, lead to that person's exclusion from the system. Compare this notion with Nobles's finding that the meaning of "family" in his San Francisco sample was primarily "psychological" rather than pragmatic or instrumental. These distinctions, however, are subtle and are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

By studying local AFDC records Stack found that 69% of the fathers in AFDC-supported black families provided support to their children and their mothers, or provided kinship affiliations in which the father's kin assumed an active role in nurturing the children. Further, of the children residing in the midwestern poverty community studied, 81% resided with their biological mothers, while 18% resided with adult female kin. These "official" AFDC figures were probably even higher in reality because changes in child-care arrangements are often made without notifying the AFDC officials. Only about 8% of young mothers were considered to have deserted their children, but even in such cases, a highly organized kinship support system was typically available for the children. Of those children not living with their biological mothers, 74% lived with their mother's kin and 26% with their father's kin. These 1972 AFDC figures closely matched Stack's own study of the community's residence patterns over the last 50 years. These and other data led Stack to conclude: "These predictable, stable child rearing patterns provide a commanding contrast to the characterization of black family life as 'broken' and 'disorganized'" (p. 73).

Stack offered an important research caveat, similar to the one offered by Hill, that family data are misleading without understanding the cultural patterns that give rise to them. "Statistical patterns do not divulge underlying cultural patterns. This confusion between statistics and cultural patterns underlies most interpretations of black family life" (Stack, 1974, p. 71).

Returning to ACYF projects, Garrett and Jenkins explored intrasystem accommodations made by families (Garrett) and by institutions (Jenkins) to presumed family-institution interactions. Although both studies suggest important questions concerning the dynamic linkages between families and institutions, each one nonetheless falls into the category of one-way effect studies.

Garrett studied changes in family living styles as a result of occupational changes induced by the introduction into a small southern town of a new industry employing semi-skilled factory workers. Of interest were comparisons among (a) women working in low paying, unskilled jobs (domestic workers), (b) women working in slightly higher paying, unskilled jobs (a cannery), (c) women working in still higher paying, semi-skilled factory jobs (a new industry), and (d) women working in professional jobs (mostly teachers).

Garrett's results formed an interesting pattern. Workers at the SES extremes (professionals and domestics) were more likely than those in the middle groups to believe that their families did not positively support their participation in the work force. Further, a substantial majority of workers in each job category felt they had adequate time to spend with their families. An exception involved the blacks in the overall professional category, almost half of whom felt they did not have enough time for their families. Only a small minority of workers felt they had "no time to relax." Although the cannery workers expressed this negative sentiment most frequently (33%), only 18% of them did not watch television nightly.

Workers in the new industry and the professionals earned higher incomes than the domestic and cannery workers and were more similar to each other in their family lifestyles and social activities than either group was to the other two groups. They also engaged in more family "togetherness" activities than did the other groups, and their togetherness activities were more likely to take place outside the home than inside the home. The suggestion that the major discrepancies in work activities and presumed social status between professionals and factory workers were overridden by their receipt of similar and relatively high incomes is of particular interest and bears future investigation.

Kanter (1977) recently demonstrated that research like Garrett's, that explores the relationship between the world of families and the world of work, has been disappointingly lacking in American behavioral and social science, and, therefore, it is to be welcomed. Garrett's contributions lie in her comparison of occupational effects on families across class, income, and employment levels. It is important that she researched working class families since the vast majority of studies on working patterns in dual occupation families have involved professional or middle-class families (Olson & Dahl, 1977). Garrett's data and conclusions are limited, however, since (a) they were derived exclusively from project-developed questionnaires and interviews and (b) the study concentrated only on the working women themselves. Although it may be an important finding in its own right that professional and domestic workers were more likely than other groups to perceive that their spouses disapproved of their working, the findings certainly would have been strengthened had their spouses, and possibly their children, also been studied. Further, it would have been useful to know from direct study more about the interior of the work world of the women studied, an addition that would have moved Garrett's work into the linkage category.

Jenkins's interest was in restructuring service agencies to achieve "ethnic fit" with the families and children they serve. Her objective was to develop an operational definition of the ethnic agency that was expressed in relative rather than absolute terms.

Through consultation with service delivery experts, she established a sample of 54 innovative ethnic agencies in six states serving five ethnic groups in urban or rural settings. Child care and development was the service most frequently delivered. Ethnic groups were Asian-American, Black-American, Native-American, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican-American. Each agency served a majority of ethnic clients, and in three-fourths of the cases, 95% of the clients were from the same ethnic group. On-site observations and a project-developed interview schedule yielded 25 ethnic commitment variables that were factor analyzed into three clusters or indices: (a) Culture defined as manifestations of ethnic culture in daily programming, such as food, art, music, observance of holidays, history, and ethnicity directives; (b) Commitment which included ideological stances taken by the agency on development of leadership for ethnic affairs, support for ethnic institutions; and (c) Matching which consisted of percentage of ethnic clients, ethnic composition of staff, agency preference and policies regarding staff-client ethnic match. Careful attention was given to instrument construction and data-analysis procedures.

No significant differences were found across ethnic groups on the Commitment and Matching variables. Significant ethnic-group variation was found, however, on the Culture scale. According to Jenkins, the three ethnic groups "whose basic spoken language is not English (the Asian-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans) scored significantly higher on the commitment scale on Culture" (A, XIV, 3). She went on to suggest that bilingual programs tended to encourage and enhance the native culture even beyond language. Bilingualism and biculturalism were nominated by program directors as themes characterizing the most successful programs. Also mentioned as successful program elements were career development, support for families and children, recruitment of minority parents for foster care and adoption, and the use of traditional tribal or cultural methods of problem-solving for effecting change in present-life situations.

Jenkins's study is particularly important because it developed a straightforward method that can be replicated easily and that can be quite helpful to service delivery systems at all levels. This ACYF-supported project suggests several important questions: Is there evidence for increased effectiveness of clearly identifiable ethnic agencies relative to more traditional agencies in serving ethnic families and children? Do ethnic groups and ethnic agencies serve mediating structure or primary group functions for families and children, and what are the most effective means for developing relationships between ethnic communities and ethnic agencies? How can ethnic agencies work effectively with service delivery bureaucracies without being co-opted by them?

Jenkins quoted Litwak and Dona (1976) as supporting these speculations. They suggest that the ethnic agency's special strength is its ability to perform both primary group functions and technical functions and thereby help overcome one of the most problematic features of modern bureaucratic service delivery systems--their highly institutional, impersonal, and frequently dehumanizing relationships with their clients. Beyond these critical human considerations, Jenkins also suggested, and we agree, that the cost-effectiveness of ethnic agencies relative to more traditional agencies is a high priority item for future research. Also indicated in studies that attempt to advance our understanding of ethnic agencies is the investigation of client families and children, which would move such research into the linkage category.

Epstein and McPartland conducted a two-phase ACYF-supported study that explored in a bidirectional fashion how influences in one system (school) augmented or interacted with influences in another system (family). Both studies used the same sample, 4,079 white students in grades 6, 7, 9, and 12 attending 16 schools in Maryland. The hypotheses concerned the relationship between (a) congruence or incongruence between schools and families measured as being "open" or "traditional" in structure and authority patterns and (b) certain child variables in the affective domain.

Family measures derived from a previously developed questionnaire included family decision-making style, level of regulation or control exercised by parents, and SES of parents. School measures included openness of classrooms and decision-making style. Student measures were sex of student, report card grades, scores on the Cognitive Abilitives Test, verbal intelligence, and affective dependent variables, including self-reliance, self-esteem, perceived quality of school life, pro-social school-task behavior, disciplinary adjustment, and goal orientation. While measurement in the affective domain is typically troublesome, the Epstein and McPartland approach was psychometrically quite sound.

A consistent pattern of interaction between student variables and configurations of family-school congruence or incongruence failed to emerge. Epstein and McPartland reported that while some interaction effects were suggested, "they failed to reach accepted levels of significance consistently across grades for any outcome or within grades for multiple outcomes by any family environmental dimension" (A, V, 2, 11). Main effects were found, however, for both school and home environments. Among those important to future research on family-institution relationships were the following: (a) Family decision-making style (degree of parental communication and participation by children) was related significantly to all outcome variables across grade levels except for goal orientation involving college plans. (b) "The most positive effects for school coping skills are related to greater shared decision-making and relatively high regulation at home" (A, V, 2, 23), suggesting that decision-making and behavior-regulation have quite different effects. (c) The variable related to social class was goal orientation, with other aspects of the home environment apparently more important than social class in predicting outcome variables, including those connected with success in school. (d) Significant correlations were found between high levels of student participation in classroom decision-making and effective school coping skills (perceived quality of school experiences, school-task behavior, and disciplinary adjustment), which held across all grade levels. This was the only significant relationship found for classroom-outcomes.[9] (e) In almost every instance, the percentage of variance explained in student outcome was greater for family variables than for school predictor variables, a particularly provocative and meaningful finding. The relationship between parent aspirations for their children and family SES status are consistent with the ETS findings presented in the first section of this chapter.

In the second phase of their report Epstein and McPartland used scores on standardized achievement tests and gender of student in addition to the variables used in the first phase. Consistent with gender effects reported in the literature they found that self-esteem, level of aspiration, and disciplinary incidents were higher for males than for females, while grades were higher for females. Somewhat less expected was the finding that

---

[9] A provocative footnote in the report (A, V, 2, 28) suggested that the main effects of school variables may be explained by student-teacher interpersonal process rather than by structure of school program. Elaboration of this point is apparently forthcoming in another report.

> no consistent interpretable interaction effects of sex with other family, school, or individual characteristics were found in this study. The differences for males and females in the contributions by variables or variable clusters to the explained variance in student outcomes are not strong enough to warrant a conclusion that different social influence processes operate for males and females. (A, V, 2, 37)

The Epstein and McPartland work was well planned and executed, has significant external validity except for a concentration on white families and a slight skew to upper SES, and has developed a firm and reliable base for future research.

We are reporting in the remainder of this section preliminary findings available in interim reports or solicited informally by us from investigators in process of finishing their ACYF-supported projects. These findings are offered selectively to facilitate development of promising hypotheses and program options.

Schaefer's study of parent-professional-child interactions is a model in method and design for two-way effect studies and one of the few in this area to combine correlational and experimental techniques.

In the initial phase, 112 children in grades 4, 5, and 6, their parents, and teachers were interviewed. Educational beliefs, attitudes, and behavior patterns, and perceptions of parent-teacher-child interactions were assessed by comprehensive and psychometrically well developed instruments. Interview data from the parents correlated significantly with the teachers' ratings of the children's performance on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Further, parents who were categorized as representing a traditional educational philosophy tended to have children who displayed low levels of adaptive behavior on the Classroom Behavior Inventory, while parents who supervised their children's homework tended to have children who scored high on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

When SES and parent interview variables were taken as predictors of classroom behavior and school performance, the variance explained was 20.5% (behavior) and 43% (performance). Taken alone, the predictors explained less than 10% of the variance of either criterion. It was concluded that parent interview variables might be construed as intervening variables for the operation of the SES variable. It should be noted that only teacher classroom experience among a host of school variables was related to any child variables. Since the attitudes, beliefs, and behavior patterns assessed by the parent interview were viewed as amenable to intervention, it was hypothesized that a child's academic achievement can be altered positively by strengthening the parent's involvement in the education process.

In the second year of Schaefer's study, a new sample was instituted for the purposes of replicating initial findings, refining and adding to the instruments, and

> establishing a knowledge basis for a school-bound and teacher-implemented intervention to support parent involvement in the child's education. Again substantial correlations were found between parents' attitudes, educational beliefs, values and behaviors and the child's classroom adaptation and achievement. Few correlations were found between teacher attitudes, beliefs and values and child outcome variables. (Personal communication, M. Edgerton, from a report by Schaefer, January 6, 1978)

The final year of the study was the intervention phase. A pretest/posttest design was used with random assignment of four experimental and four control kindergarten classrooms. Kindergarten teachers were trained to encourage parents' participation at home in their children's education. In one subgroup teachers visited in the homes. Dependent measures included instruments used in the first two years of the study, as well as subtests from the Test of Basic Experiences and the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence.

> Initial evaluations of the intervention program show that the intervention sample had significantly lower scores on the Test of Basic Experiences Language and Mathematics subtests in the spring after controlling for sociodemographic variables and for fall Concept scores. Also parents who reported utilizing the materials sent home by the teacher had children with lower achievement scores. The home visit sample also showed lower Language scores than a matched control group. (Personal communication, M. Edgerton, from a report by Schaefer, January 6, 1978)

While Schaefer and his colleagues have not completed the analysis of these remarkable findings, they have advanced several possible explanations. One was that parental involvement under certain conditions may have negative effects on a child's learning by changing the educational focus from the teacher to the parent. This might cast the parent in more of an instrumental than an expressive role whereas the reverse may be indicated by the child's developmental and educational needs. Moreover, the teacher may be distracted from classroom functions. Such an explanation is not inconsistent with Bronfenbrenner's (1974) assertion that different intervention approaches are required for different developmental stages, with the early need for and desirability of intensive parental involvement and control of the educational process lessening as children approach the age of elementary school entrance. This is clearly one of the most interesting, important, and controversial findings in the recent literature.

Fleming and Sussman are studying family-school linkages. Although very limited data were available at the time of our report the study is discussed here in some detail because it employs constructs and measures that are important in understanding the linkage process.

Fleming and Sussman, like Epstein and McPartland and Schaefer, are interested in the degree of congruence between families' and teachers' expectations, attitudes, and values concerning the educational experience. The variables of interest here, however, are not a child's achievement or behavior, but the transactions themselves between school and family. Teachers' backgrounds are viewed relative to the ethnicity and structure of families. The bureaucratic structure of the school, with its mandate to deal with children in prescribed ways, is viewed relative to families' beliefs about child rearing and socialization patterns.

The sample was made up of mostly low SES white, black, and Puerto Rican families having their first contacts with the public schools in a Cleveland suburb. Mothers were interviewed before school began and at the end of the first semester, as were a random subsample of fathers. First grade teachers responded to questionnaires on their educational philosophy that was corroborated by observations of their classrooms. Finally, teachers filled out behavioral, academic, and social profiles on each student at the end of the semester. Most measures were either standardized or had been used in previous studies.

Fleming and Sussman's preliminary findings include the following: (a) by the end of the first semester of the children's first school year mothers showed significantly more negative attitudes toward school than they had shown prior to school entry; (b) the educational experience was valued most highly by whites, followed in order by Puerto Ricans and blacks; (c) black and Puerto Rican mothers expected their children to display personal health habits earlier than did white mothers; (d) across ethnic and SES levels mothers' aspirations for children's performance were consistently lower than teachers' aspirations; (e) across ethnic and SES levels mothers expected teachers to be more friendly and less academically oriented than teachers either judged themselves to be or judged mothers to prefer; (f) politeness, smartness, being well dressed, neatness, and obedience were judged important for school success by mothers, while teachers were more inclined to regard as important the ability to generate new ideas; (g) mothers were likely to view the nature of their participation in terms of volunteering for school-related duties and parents' day visits, while teachers saw visiting the school on a regular school day and attending community meetings as more important; (h) teacher opinions were more likely to be agreed with by white mothers than black or Puerto Rican mothers; (i) mothers' willingness to seek redress for grievances against teachers were less after 6 months of school attendance than prior to their children's school entry; (j) across ethnic and SES levels, mothers reported "comfortable" feelings about interactions with their children's teachers.

These preliminary findings covered analyses of only two dimensions, (a) changes in mothers' attitudes after 6 months of interaction with the schools and (b) degree of congruence between mothers' and teachers' educational and social beliefs. Ultimately, Fleming and Sussman are pursuing answers to the question: what are the appropriate styles of relating between families and school that insure that families receive the service(s) they need while preserving their natural capacities to perform critical functions for themselves? Parenthetically, Schaefer's surprising findings might be interpreted in the context of this question. The possibility exists that natural family capacities alone or in combination with critical bureaucratic functions were disrupted by virtue of the particular intervention Schaefer carried out.

Promising Hypotheses and Program Implications

In order to advance ACYF's family research program, a generic theory and related data base on the relationship between families and formal organizations must be developed. The functioning of specific institutions relative to specific types of families must be understood within a general framework. Toward this end, the following issues might be considered:

1. What is the optimal "distance" between families and bureaucracies and how might it be achieved? That this is a critical problem is underscored by Rosser's suggestion that families are becoming unwilling to make major changes in lifestyles to accommodate a delivery system's offer of "service." Further, since mothers in Fleming and Sussman's study felt less able to obtain redress for grievances against the educational system after engaging with it for a mere 6 months, perhaps they need mediating structures to modulate the psychological distance between their families and that bureaucracy. Litwak and Meyer (1966) have studied approaches to establishing distance that permit common goals to be accomplished by families and bureaucracies without disrupting either system's functioning. This is a particularly fruitful direction for future research.

2. What is the most appropriate typology for family-institution linkages? Sussman (1972) has made strides in this area by specifying family life sectors, such as health, economic, and leisure concerns, and relating them dynamically to various bureaucratic factors. Cernea (1975) reminds us of the reciprocity between families and institutions. More research is indicated to bring order to the enormous complexity.

3. How do kinship systems function for human development? Litwak (1959) pointed out that human service delivery systems rarely consider the inherent capacities of these mediating structures. He has explored the policy implications of recognizing that extended family kin networks can give social support to isolated family units. The work of Hill, Litwak, Stack, and others should be extended in future research.

4. How can methodological problems in transactional research be solved? All transactional approaches to research, whether they involve dyads, intrafamily processes, or family-institution relationships, have common methodological problems. Hartup (in press) reminds us, however, that the simplest, most immediate solution to these problems, until major logical or mathematical breakthroughs occur, is to ask the right questions. Research should be funded and conducted that has clear, logical hypotheses and carefully worked-out methods. Research on methods and instrument development must also be supported.

These recommendations are offered once again by our group, undoubtedly the latest in a long line of such groups offering these seeming counsels of perfection. We are convinced more than ever that the tyranny of data can only be overcome by conducting excellent scientific work in this complex but important area.

Our most basic suggestion for future ACYF research is to pursue development of a general theory of family-institution transactions that is applicable to the broadest possible range of family types, ethnic groups, and socioeconomic backgrounds. On the institutional side, the understanding must encompass the broadest possible range of institutional sizes, types (e.g., profit, nonprofit, governmental), human service functions, and more general societal functions (e.g., private sector business, unions, government, religious). We believe that the roots for such a theory exist in the family-institution research funded for the past 3 years by ACYF. The instrumentation and methodology of Schaefer and Epstein and of McPartland moved toward a transactional approach. The results of Jenkins's study suggested ways in which bureaucratic structure might be converted to a mediating structure for certain service populations. Rosser and Nobles introduced the interactive effects of kinship networks as mediating structures enhancing functioning in the single family unit. Garrett demonstrated that the workplace and its linkages into the family must be dealt with by American families. Finally, Sussman explicitly introduced the concept of linkages.

If future research is funded on the basis of (a) being sufficiently circumscribed in location and intent as to offer clear results on particularly promising service delivery systems and (b) having sufficient external validity to contribute to a general theory of transaction, we believe that ACYF could be in a position to make a unique contribution to research on the family.

The approach represented by Fleming and Sussman, Litwak, and others is capable both of subsuming one-way effect and bidirectional effect approaches (discussed earlier in this section) and forming a useful theoretical backdrop for the research presented in the first two sections of this chapter on developmental influences and intervention. This transactional perspective on the linkages within family-institution systems is among the most powerful and sophisticated today, and it should be considered seriously by ACYF for use in building its own theoretical base and in establishing priorities for future research.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are offered for (a) theory, (b) research and program development, and (c) methodology and technical assistance.

Theoretical Issues That Researchers Should Address Explicitly in Proposing Ecologically Oriented Research on Children, Youth, and Families

The family research program pursued by ACYF has been cast in ecological terms. For the individual person, the family is seen as the most critical aspect of the social ecology, and the family is enmeshed in a network of relatives, friends, neighbors, workmates, and institutional forms, such as extended families, kin networks, churches, voluntary agencies, self-help groups, and other support groups. Theoretical perspectives necessary to encompass the social ecology of families are in the areas of (a) family development, (b) intrafamilial systems relative to transaction systems, (c) life stress, (d) mediating structures or support systems, (e) liaison or linkage, and (f) pluralism in American life.

Family Development

Reuben Hill and colleagues believe that theory bearing both on time (development) and space (network) is now necessary for useful research on the family (Hill & Mattessich, 1977). Family development theory (Mattessich, 1976) is oriented to the question, How do families meet their needs and reach their goals? It is cast in the context of family's "age" defined by three functions: (a) change in the number of family members, (b) the developmental stage of the oldest child, and (e) the retirement status of the breadwinner. There are eight stages of development in which one can consider the needs, goals, stresses, and resources of families:

1. childless married families,
2. childbearing families,
3. families with preschool children,
4. families with school children,
5. families with adolescents,
6. families with young adults,
7. families in middle years,
8. aging families.

ACYF has been, and presumably will continue to be, interested primarily in families in Stages 2 through 5. It would be useful for ACYF to specify family development stages as a guide for its funding, and for investigators to specify the developmental stages of participating families.

Intrafamily Systems and Transaction Systems

According to this approach (Mattessich, 1976), one looks at family members' interactions and their transactions with the larger society. Potential units and variables for this type of investigation are listed in Table 1. The variables are illustrative of those derived from a theory of social ecology, and exemplify what is needed to study the impacts of changes and lifestyles upon the family (or children within the family). We encourage ACYF to specify the variables that it wishes researchers to use in future studies in order to help attain comparability in the study of impacts on the family.

Life Stress

All families have characteristic lifestyles, the ways in which they carry out their daily rounds. Daily activities serve to meet needs, organize life, cope with stresses, and pursue goals. Research could profitably address two aspects of family functioning:

1. the ways in which daily rounds are structured to meet basic needs; and
2. stressful breaks in the daily rounds that force the person or family to use reserve resources to deal with threat to the family's survival (or stability).

Both concepts make up the construct of stress, and should be looked at carefully in basic ecological and environmental contexts. The first reflects the family's adaptation to its social environment, and is experienced as strain or tension. The second is acute stress that often results from an event that requires short-term extraordinary coping responses. It is usually experienced as overload.

Stress theory provides a way to think about matters that impede effective family functioning. The stressors serve as stimuli to which persons react, their reactions being more or less adequate. If there are ways to use resources to meet the strain or the overload, the effects will vary, and may even be attenuated. Mediators of these effects are both (a) the strength of the person and (b) the supportiveness of the social structures (e.g., family).

Competence describes how well persons and groups operate. Groups can be efficient and effective. They can be creative and humane. Competent performance is a goal for most American families, no matter what their particular purposes or forms. Competent, effective functioning

Table 1

Units and Variables for The Study of Intrafamily Systems and Transaction Systems

Unit	Examples of variables associated with unit
Intrafamily systems	
Individual	satisfaction (general marital), self-esteem, confidence in outside aid sources, commitment to neighborhood, level of health, competence to perform family roles, rationality, use of violence, developmental stage
Marital dyad	division of labor, decision making, amount of time together, number of joint activities, coordination, conflict, stability or permanence
Parent-child	authority, effectiveness of training, companionship, impact upon parent's time, type of discipline, closeness of bond, number of joint activities
Sibling subsystem	authority, companionship, cooperation, mutual socialization
Nuclear family	cohesiveness, division of labor, size, life cycle stage, developmental task performance, authority structure, distribution of power, number of joint activities, amount of resources, mobility
Transaction systems (links to other networks)	
Extended family	extensity of relationships, intensity of relationships, amount of mutual assistance, obligations, ability to live together.
School	frequency of activation and time required, expectations of school

Table 1 (Continued)

Unit	Examples of variables associated with unit
Transaction systems (links to other networks)	
Community	amount of social and political participation, information processing
Work	compatibility of family/work schedules
Marketplace	consumership

Note. From "Taxonomies for family impact analysis" by P. Mattessich. Minneapolis: Minnesota State Planning Agency, August 1976.

by families in the face of life stresses should be a research focus.

Mediating Structures or Support Systems

According to this approach, the individual relates to others in the society through large and small structures. Our society, which is predominantly industrial, urban, and changing, tends toward institutional, organizational, and bureaucratic structures. Berger and Neuhaus (1977) note that the functions of public policy have been to increase the strength of large structures because of a categorical approach to problems and their solutions. Small structures (e.g., families, neighborhoods, churches, and voluntary associations) serve to help people relate to the collectivity. These small structures often are damaged by categorical programs. We are persuaded that mediating social structures are among the most important ones in modern society, and we recommend that ACYF's theoretical orientation include an emphasis on their roles and functions.

Liaison or Linkage

The linkages among individuals, families, mediating structures, organizations, and bureaucracies is the subject matter of liaison theory. It also deals with network building, in which initiatives are taken often by informal and formal helpers alike to ensure that the interactions of individuals, mediating structures, and large structures meet the needs of individuals and families. We suggest that ACYF's theoretical orientation should include explicit reference to individual-collectivity transactions, the adequacy with which individual needs are met, and liaison functions.

Pluralism in American Life

Pluralism is an explicit goal of American life, yet the pursuit of pluralism is troublesome (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977). This is due presumably to categorical approaches inherent in present public policy and bureaucratic ways of operating. Yet the goal of pluralism is the achievement of common purpose through the enhancement of myriad particular interests. The interests of diverse families as active forces in the society need specification in theory and examination in research. Families have command over some resources, have decision-making capability, and produce goods and services that help or hinder the society. It is important to study families as families in their diversity, as well as their effects on the individuals who live in them. Interests of diverse families should be enhanced through public policy, with the intent to protect the plural interests in society in pursuit of the commonweal.

Recommendations for Research and Program Development

These recommendations were derived from our examination of ACYF-supported family research projects viewed within the context of other research on the family. They are couched mostly as questions that researchers should address.

Recommended Research Questions for Family Development and Child-Rearing

1. What are the important family process variables that mediate the effects of a variety of family structures on child development outcomes?

2. How does the coping ability of families within and between different status-variable groups (e.g., SES, ethnic group, family structure) differ as a function of relative stress, available supports, and utilized support systems? Is family coping skill a significant predictor of child outcomes?

3. What are the different support systems needed by families at different stages of family development?

4. What are the effects of parental expectations on children's

aspirations and developmental outcomes? What are the effects of children's behavior patterns on parental expectations?

5. Are the presence of siblings and the nature of sibling relationships significant sources of support (or stress) to the child in helping (or hindering) social adaptation and development?

6. What are the important dimensions of family-child interactions that mediate the effects of TV programming on the socialization of children?

7. What are the high-risk combinations of constitutional and environmental factors (e.g., children's biological rhythms and school scheduling) that will provide for precise targets of appropriate interventions?

8. Are interventions regarding child-rearing most effective when they are sought by families rather than imposed upon them? If so, why?

Recommended Research Directions and Questions for Intervention

1. Future research and demonstration efforts might profitably:

    a. support families in their diverse forms, recognizing that some family situations allow parents to remain in the home, while others require parents to be away;
    b. focus on both family and child development, and go beyond exclusive concern with the cognitive domain to consider affective and social development;
    c. avoid exclusive concern with the first three to five years of life, and recognize the need for both early and continuing intervention;
    d. build on existing neighborhood and community mediating structures and resources; and
    e. use a research and development strategy wherein time and money are available for planning, theory development, building on the research knowledge base, adapting to local conditions, careful development and evaluation of program elements, summative evaluation over several program waves, developing curriculum and staff training programs, and careful field testing and replication.

2. Are there identifiable factors in the ecological environments of young children that are as critical to school achievement as early intervention programs? Do the following variables have effects on school achievement, and, subsequently, on competent functioning:

    a. kinship structure and functioning;

   b. family's community status; and
   c. agencies or services (e.g., churches, voluntary associations, early education programs) that recognize and support the special needs of different cultural groups?

3. Will a research effort that concentrates on the improvement of valid and reliable measures of social and emotional development lead to better and expanded programming efforts?

4. How can support be delivered more effectively to families with specific and immediate needs related to particular crises? What is the role of mediating structures in these crises?

Recommended Research Questions for Family-Institution Relationships

1. What features of mediating structures (e.g., kinship networks, neighborhoods, churches, voluntary organizations, and other primary support groups) make them more or less able to support family and child development?

2. In what ways do service systems bypass and undermine the functions of mediating structures that support family and child development?

3. What are the natural caregiving functions of extended kin for different family developmental stages and for different ethnic groups?

4. Are the interactions of family characteristics with school characteristics—and the quality of the relationships between the two systems—more powerful predictors of child outcomes than the characteristics of either system alone?

5. What is the most useful typology for service systems that delineates interventions according to their impacts on mediating structures and thence on family and child development?

6. Does community control of service systems enhance understanding by agency personnel of indigenous family forms and structures?

7. What are the critical intraorganizational policies and community linkages for a service system that are necessary for its acceptance in the local community?

Recommendations for Methodology and Technical Assistance

Recommendations for Methodological Aspects of All Projects

1. Priority should be given to projects that develop or use valid, reliable measures, especially for (a) socioemotional/affective

development and (b) interpersonal interactions.

2. Priority should be given to projects that
   a. propose longitudinal study of specified variables and interactions, and
   b. propose continued follow-up examinations of groups studied by projects previously funded.

Recommendations for Technical Assistance

1. A program of technical assistance should be provided by ACYF for all projects, and particularly for new, promising entrants into the field of research and demonstration. It should help ensure that:
   a. the theoretical and conceptual foundations are clearly developed;
   b. the design provides for testing the hypotheses set forward, and includes comparison groups;
   c. the instrumentation is appropriate to the variables to be measured.
2. Technical assistance should also be extensive at the later phases of the project, especially at analysis and write-up times. Some process to interrelate project findings, to integrate knowledge, and to develop recommendations for the agency would be very helpful. The investigators should be integral to this process.
3. Technical assistance should be provided in a way that supports the work so that it achieves both the purposes of the investigator and the purposes of the agency.
4. Technical assistance should be a combination effort between agency staff and experts in the field so that it avoids bureaucratic direction, on the one hand, and the personal whimsy of particular individuals, on the other.
5. Some technical assistance should be provided by groups outside the government that respond to a Request for Proposal and are chosen competitively.

Conclusion

This chapter represents the opinions of the authors in the form of observations, questions, and recommendations. They are offered to ACYF and to the field as specific suggestions for action. As such, they can be debated and revised during the course of policymaking. We hope that they will be effective stimuli for action to direct and improve ACYF's very important commitment to family research.

REFERENCES

Aldous, J., & Dahl, N. *International bibliography of research in marriage and the family*, Volume II, 1965-1972. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974.

Aldous. J. & Hill, R. *International bibliography of research in marriage and the family,* 1900-1964. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.

Ariès, P. The family and the city. *Daedalus*, 1977, *106*(2), 227-235.

Bane, M. J. *Here to stay: American families in the twentieth century*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Barker, R. G. Explorations in ecological psychology. *American Psychologist*, 1965, *20*, 1-14.

Barker, R. G. *Ecological psychology: Concepts and methods for studying the environment of human behavior*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychological Monographs*, 1967, *75*, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 1971, *4*.

Baumrind, D. The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. D. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota symposia on child psychology*. Vol. 7. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1973.

Bayley, N. Mental growth during the first three years. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1933, *14*.

Bayley, N. Individual patterns of development. *Child Development*, 1965, *27*, 45-74.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, I. *Teaching disadvantaged children in preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Berger, P. L., & Neuhaus, R. J. *To empower people. The role of mediating structures in public policy*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977.

Bernard, J. *Marriage and family among negroes*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Billingsley, A. Black families in white America. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Bloom, B. S. Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Bowlby, J. The nature of the child's tie to this mother. International Journal of Psychoanalysis. 1958, 39, 350-373.

Brazelton, T. B. Neonatal behavioral assessment scale. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1973.

Brazelton, T. B., Koslowski, B., & Main, M. The origins of reciprocity: The early mother-infant interaction. In M. Lewis & L. A. Rosenblum (Eds.), The effect of the infant on its caregiver. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 1977, 32, 513-531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Is early intervention effective? A report on longitudinal evaluations of pre-school programs (Vol. 2). Wash., D. C.: Department of HEW, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Burlingham, D., & Freud, A. Infants without families. London: Allen & Unwin, 1944.

Cernea, M. The large scale formal organization and the family group. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 30, 927-936.

Clark, A. M., & Clarke, A. D. B. Early experience: Myth and evidence. London: Open Books, 1976.

Clarke-Stewart, A. Interactions between mothers and their young children Characteristics and consequences. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1973, 38.

Cohen, D. K. Loss as a theme in social policy. Harvard Education Review, 1976, 46, 553-571.

Dusek, J. B., & O'Connell, E. J. Teacher expectancy effects on achievement test performance of elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65, 371-377.

Elder, G. Children of the great depression. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Elkin, F., & Handel, G. The child and society: The process of socialization. New York: Random House, 1978.

Farber, B. *Kinship and class: A midwestern study*. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Farber, B., Harvey, D. L., & Lewis, M. *Research and development program on preschool disadvantaged children: Community, kinship and competence: Final Report*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education 1969.

Fein, G. G. *The social context of mother-infant relations: A study of home based education*. Unpublished manuscript, Merrill-Palmer Institute, 1978.

Finn, J. D. Expectations and the educational environment. *Review of Educational Research*, 1972, *42*, 387-410.

Freud, A. *The ego and the mechanisms of defense*. London: Hogarth, 1937.

Gephart, W. J., & Bartos, B. B. Profiling instructional package. *Phi Delta Kappa Occasional Paper*, August 1969.

Gesell, A. Thompson, H., & Amatruda, C. S. *The psychology of early growth*. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

Glick, I. D., & Haley, J. *Family therapy and research: An annotated bibliography of articles and books published 1950-1970*. New York: Greene & Stratton, 1971.

Glick, P. C. A demographer looks at American families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 1975, 37, 15-26.

Goebes, D. D., & Shore, M. F. Behavior expectations of students as related to the sex of the teacher. *Psychology of the Schools*, 1975, *12*, 222-224.

Gordon, I. J. *A parent education approach to provision of early stimulation for the culturally disadvantaged*. A Final Report to the Fund for the Advancement of Education established by the Ford Foundation. Gainesville: Institute for Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, November 1967.

Gordon, I. J., & Guinagh, B. J. *A home learning approach to early stimulation: Final Report*. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1974.

Gray, I. W., & Klaus, R. A. An experimental preschool program for culturally deprived children. *Child Development*, 1965, 36, 887-898.

Gump, P. Ecological psychology and children. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.) *Review of child development research* (Vol. 5). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Hareven, T. K. Family time and historical time. Daedalus, 1977, 106(2), 57-70.

Hartup, W. W. Perspectives on child and family interaction: Past, present, and future. In R. M. Lerner & G. B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction: A life-span perspective. New York: Academic Press, in press.

Hertz, T. W. The ecology of child development: Research issues. The child/the family/environment/services. A Report for Planners of Research and Development. Prepared for the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development, Washington, D. C.: George Washington University, December 1976.

Hill, R. The strengths of black families. New York. Emerson Hall, 1972.

Hill, R., & Hansen, D. A. The identification of conceptual frameworks utilized in family study. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 299-311.

Hill, R. Personal Communication, January 4, 1978.

Hill, R., & Mattessich, P. Reconstruction of family development theories: A progress report. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, San Diego, October 1977.

Hunt, J. McV. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Jensen, A. R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1-123.

Kanter, R. M. Work and family in the United States: A cultural review and agenda for research and policy. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1977.

Karnes, M. B. Research and development program on preschool disadvantaged children: Investigations of classroom and at-home interventions: Final report. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1969.

Keniston, K. All our children. The American family under pressure. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Kessen, W., & Fein, G. Variations in home-based infant education: Language, play and social development. Final Report. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Child Development, 1975.

Klaus, R. A., & Gray, S. W. The early training project for disadvantaged children: A report after five years: *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 1968, *33* (4, Serial No. 120).

Lasch, C. The family and history. *New York Review of Books,* November 13, 1975, pp. 33-38.

Lasch, C. *Haven in a heartless world: The family besieged*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Levenstein, P., & Sunley, R. Stimulation of verbal interacton between disadvantaged mothers and children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1968, *38*, 116-121.

Lewin, K. Behavior and development as a function of the total situation. In L. Carmichael (Ed.) *Manual of child pscyhology* New York: Wiley, 1954.

Litwak, E. The use of extended family groups in the achievement of social goals: Some policy implications. *Social Problems*, 1959, *7*(3), 178-187.

Litwak, E. & Meyer, H. A balance theory of coordination between bureaucratic organizations and community primary groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1966a, *11*(1), 31-58.

Litwak, E. & Meyer, H. *Relationship between school community coordinating procedures and reading achievement*. (Final report for the U. S. Office of Education). Washington D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1966b.

Litwak, E. & Dona, J. *Forms of ethnic relations, organizational theory and social policy in modern industrial society*. Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

Litwak, E., & Szelenyi, I. Primary group structure and their functions: Kin, Neighbors and Friends. *American Sociological Review*, 1969, *34*(4), 465.

Madden, J., Levenstein, P., & Levenstein, I. Longitudinal IQ outcomes of the mother-child home program. *Child Development*, 1976, *47*, 1015-1025.

Malpass, D. & Robinson, S. *Study of the family from a sociological perspective*. Unpublished manuscript. George Peabody College, 1977.

Mattessich, P. *Taxonomies for family impact analysis*. Minneapolis: Minnesota State Agency, 1976.

Mendels, G. E. & Flanders, J. P. Teacher expectations and pupil performance. American Educational Research Journal, 1973, 10, 203-212.

Miller, N. E., & Dollard, J. Social learning and imitation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

Moynihan, D. P. The negro family, the case for national action. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Dept. of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research, March 1965.

National Academy of Sciences. Toward a national policy for children and families. Washington: Author, 1976.

Nye, F. I., & Bernardo, F. M. Emerging conceptual frameworks in family analysis. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Olson, D. H. L., & Dahl, N. S. Inventory of marriage and family literature, 1973 & 1974, Volume III. St. Paul: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota, 1977.

Olson, D. H. L., & Dahl, N. S. Inventory of marriage and family literature 1975 & 1976, Volume IV. St. Paul: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota, 1977.

Parsons, T. The structure of social actions. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1947.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. Family, socialization & interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Parsons, T. The social structure of the family. In R. Anshen (Ed.), The family: Its function and destiny (Rev. ed.). New York: Harper, 1959.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobsen, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Sameroff, A. J., & Chandler, M. J. Reproductive risk and the continuum of caretaking casualty. In F. D. Horowitz (Ed.), Review of child development research (Vol. 4). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Schaefer, E. I. Progress report: Intellectual stimulation of culturally deprived parents. National Institute of Mental Health, 1968.

Schaefer, E. I. Need for early and continuing education. In V. Denberg (Ed.), Education of the infant and young child. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Schaefer, E. I. Personal Communication, January 6, 1978.

Schaefer, E. I. & Aaronson, M. Infant education research project: Implementation and implications of the home-tutoring program. In R. K. Parker (Ed.), The preschool in action. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Sears, R. R. Your ancients revisted. A history of child development. In E. M. Heatherington (Ed.), Review of child development research (Vol. 5). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Shorter, E. The making of the modern family. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Skinner, B. F. Walden Two. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Skinner, B. F. Verbal behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Smith, M. B. School and home: Focus on achievement. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Developing programs for the educationally disadvantaged. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

Sparling, J. J., & Gallagher, J. J. Research directions for the 70's in child development. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1971.

Stack, C. B. All our kin. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Stedman, D. J., Anastasiow, N. J., Dokecki, P. R., Gordon, I. J., & Parker, R. K. How can effective early intervention programs be delivered to potentially retarded children? A Report to the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. October 1972.

Steiner, G. The children's cause. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution, 1976.

Stern, D. The first relationship: Infant and mother. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Sussman, M. Family, kinship and bureaucracy. In A. Campbell & P. Converse (Eds.) The human meaning of social change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. Temperament and development. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1977.

Thomas, A., Chess, S., & Birch, H. G. Temperament and behavior disorders in children. New York: New York University Press, 1968.

Weikart, D. P. A comparative study of three preschool curricula. A paper presented at the bi-annual meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Santa Monica, March 1969.

Weikart, D. P., Kamii, C. K., & Radin, N. L. Perry preschool project progress report. Ipsilanti: High Scope, 1964.

Weikart, D. P., & Lambie, D. Z. Preschool intervention through a home teaching program. In J. Hellmuth (Ed.), Disadvantaged child (Vol. 2). New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1968.

Werner, E. E., Bierman, J. M., & French, F. E. The children of Kauai. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971.

Westinghouse Learning Corporation. The impact of Head Start: An evaluation of the Head Start experience on children's cognitive and affective development. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1969.

Yarrow, L. J., Rubenstein, J. L., & Pedersen, F. A. Infant and environment: Early cognitive and motivational development. New York: John Wiley, 1975.

APPENDIX A

ACYF-Funded Projects Selected for This Study

I. Alston, L. *Parent-teacher intervention patterns in early moral training* (OCD-90-C-634)

  1. Alston, L. *Parent-teacher intervention patterns in early moral training* (Continuation Proposal for 1975-77). New York: Baruch College, CUNY, 1975.
  2. Alston, L. Parent-teacher intervention patterns in early moral training. (Extension for period of June, 1977—December, 1977). New York: Baruch College, CUNY, 1977.

     Mr. Alston was contacted by our staff, but reported that no data analysis has yet been carried out in this study.

II. Bell, S. M. *Cognitive development in early childhood* (OCD-90-C-261)

  1. Bell, S. M. *Mother-child interaction in the first three years of life and its relation to cognitive development* (Interim Report of August 31, 1975, for period of September, 1974—August, 1975). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, 1975.
  2. Bell, S. M. *Cognitive development and mother-child interaction* (Draft of partial final report). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, 1975.

III. Browning, M. *Health institutions and the child* (OCD-90-C-906)

  1. Browning, M., Morgan, L., Gummerman, K., Langlois, J., et al. *Health institutions and the child* (Continuation 1). Austin, Tex.: Texas Department of Public Welfare, Special Projects Bureau, June 29, 1977.
  2. Browning, M., Morgan, L., Gummerman, K., Langlois, J., et al. *Health institutions and the child* (First Year Annual Report). Austin, Tex.: Texas Department of Public Welfare, Special Projects Bureau, June 29, 1977.
  3. Browning, M. *Health institutions and the child*. Austin, Tex.: Texas Department of Public Welfare, Special Projects Bureau.

     Mr. Browning was contacted by our staff and reported that all data collection in this longitudinal study will not have been completed until the summer of 1978. The continuation application of March 31, 1977, was submitted prior to any data gathering, although recruitment of subjects had begun.

IV. Corrasco, F. F. *The Chicano child and his neighborhood: Intellectual, social, and cultural impact* (OCD-90-C-633)

  1. Carrasco, F. F., Wilkins-Vigil, W. G., & Auslander, N. *The Chicano child and his neighborhood: Intellectual, social,*

and cultural impact (Continuation Proposal and Report). Denver, Colo.: Juarez Lincoln Center, n.d.

2. Carrasco, F. F., Wilkins-Vigil, W. G., & Auslander, N. The Chicano child and his neighborhood: Intellectual, social, and cultural impact. (Final Report). Denver, Colo.: Juarez Lincoln Center. n.d.

V. Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. Over time effects and interactions of family and school authority structures on child development (OCD-90-C-904)

1. Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. Family and school interactions and main effects on affective outcomes (Final Report, Report No. 235). Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University, September 1977.
2. Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. Sex differences in family and school influence on students outcomes (Final Report, Report No. 236). Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University, September 1977.
3. Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. Over time effects and interaction of family and school authority structure and child development. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University. n.d.

VI. Garcia, E. E. Preschool bilingual research program (OCD-90-C-262)

1. Garcia, E. E. Preschool bilingual research program (Progress Report). Santa Barbara: University of California, February, 1975.
2. Garcia, E. E. Preschool bilingual research program (Progress Report). Santa Barbara: University of California, February, 1976.
3. Garcia, E. E. Preschool bilingual research program (Final Report). Santa Barbara: University of California, 1977.

VII. Garrett, A. M. Effects of occupational shift on family life style (OCD-90-C-263)

1. Garrett, A. M. Effects of occupational shift on family life style (Final Report: 7/1/74-6/30/75). Lafayette, La.: University of Southwest Louisiana, 1975.

VIII. Goldberg, S., & Quinn, B. Development of parental attachment (OCD-90-C-38)

1. Goldberg, S., & Quinn, B. Development of parental attachment (Progress Report). Amherst, Ma.: University of Massachusetts, 1976.

No final report was received for this study though it was requested. Ms. Goldberg was called February 6, 1978, by our staff requesting further information. Barbara Quinn DiVito subsequently sent a data write-up on infants through age 4 months (not older ages).

IX. Greenberg, B. Parental mediation of children's social learning from television (OCD-90-C-635)

1. Greenberg, B. S., Atkin, C. K., & Earhart, E. Parental mediation of children's social learning from television (Continuation). Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, March 1977.
2. Greenberg, B. S., Atkin, C. K., & Earhart, E. Parental mediation of children's social learning from television (Continuation 1). Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, August 1977.
3. Hines, M., Greenberg, B. S., & Buerkel, N. An analysis of family role structures and interaction in commercial television. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, November 1977.
4. Greenberg, B. S., & Atkin, C. K. Statement at public hearings of the National Parent-Teacher Association. Hartford: February 1977.
5. Greenberg, B. S., & Atkin, C. K. Current trends in research on children and television: Social behavior content portrayals and effects in the family context. Berlin, Germany: May 1977.
6. Greenberg, B. S., Atkin, C. K., Edison, N. G., & Korzenny, E. Pro-social and anti-social behaviors on commercial television in 1975-76. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, February 1977.
7. Fernandez-Collada, C., Greenberg, B. S., Korzenny, F., & Atkin, C. K. Substance use and sexual intimacy on commercial television. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, 1977.
8. Simmons, K. W., Greenberg, B. S., & Atkin, C. K. The demography of fictional television characters in 1975-76. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, 1977.

X. Grow, L. J. A study of childrearing by young white mothers (OCD-CB-456)

Note: Syne, Anne W. was Principal Investigator on Original Proposal, 1973.

1. Grow, L. J. A study of childrearing by young white mothers (Progress Report of 3/74-2/75). New York: Child Welfare League of America.
2. Grow, L. J. A study of childrearing by young white mothers (Progress Report of 3/75-2/76). New York: Child Welfare League of America.
3. Grow, L. J. A study of childrearing by young white mothers (Progress Report of 3/76-2/77). New York: Child Welfare League of America.

Final report is expected 2/28/78.

XI. Guinagh, B. J. *School performance as a function of early stimulation* (OCD-90-C-638)
   1. Guinagh, B. J., & Gordon, I. J. *School performance as a function of early stimulation* (Final Report). Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for Development of Human Resources, College of Education, University of Florida, 1976.

XII. Hardy, J. B. *Ecological influences in the socialization of the urban child* (OCD-90-C-572)
   1. Hardy, J. B., Welcher, D. W., Mellits, E. D., & Richardson, A. H. *Socialization of the urban child* (Draft Final Report). Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, 1978.

      Ms. Hardy was contacted and additional information requested. Several sections of the final report were shared with us. These proved very helpful.

XIII. Hock, E. *Alternative approaches to child rearing and their effects on the mother-infant relationship* (OCD-CB-490)
   1. Hock, E. *Alternative approaches to child rearing and their effects on the mother-infant relationship* (Final Report). Columbus, Ohio: Department of Family Relations and Human Development and Department of Pediatrics, The Ohio State University and Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, 1976.

XIV. Jenkins, S. *Ethnic factors in child welfare* (OCD-90-C-574)
   1. Jenkins, S. *Ethnicity and child welfare* (Progress Report). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1976.
   2. Jenkins, S. *Ethnicity and child welfare: The agency defined* (Progress Report). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1977.
   3. Jenkins, S. *Ethnic factors in child welfare* (Final Report). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1977.

XV. Kammerman, S. B. *Child advocacy methods and techniques* (OCD-CB-386)
   1. Kahn, A. J., & McGowan, B. G. *Child advocacy methods and techniques* (Continuation 1). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work. n.d.
   2. Kahn, A. J., & McGowan, B. G. *Child advocacy methods and techniques* (Continuation 2). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work. n.d.
   3. Finestone, S., & Kammerman, S. B. *Classification and analysis of selected child advocacy projects* (Final Report). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1973.
   4. McGowan, B. *Case advocacy: A study of the interventive process in child advocacy* (Final Report). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1973.

5. Kahn, A. J., & Kammerman, S. B. Child advocacy methods and techniques. New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, n.d.

Earlier studies from fiscal year 1972 were forwarded to us by ACYF. Since these are prior to our beginning point for fiscal year 1974, we considered only Ms. Kammerman's study "Child Care, Social Services, and the Working Mother" (10/1/75-9/30/77). Our staff contacted Ms. Kammerman, and she reported that further information on the study would not be available until the summer of 1978. No body of analyzable data existed in the continuation proposal.

XVI. Katz, P. Modification of children's racial attitudes (OCD-CB-151)

1. Katz, P. Modification of children's racial attitudes (Continuation 1). New York: Graduate Division, City University of New York, jointly with the Research Foundation of City University of New York, 1975.
2. Katz, P. Modification of children's racial attitudes (Final Report). New York: Graduate Division, City University of New York jointly with the Research Foundation of City University of New York, 1972.

XVII. Lazar, I. The Consortium on Developmental Continuity (ACYF 18-76-07843)

1. Lazar, I., Hubbell, V. R., Murray, H., et al. The persistence of preschool effects: A long term follow-up of fourteen infant and preschool experiments (Final Report). Ithaca, N.Y.: Community Service Laboratory, New York State College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, 1977.
2. Lazar, I., Hubbell, V. R., Murray, H., et al. The persistence of preschool effects: Vol. 2. Instruments and papers presented, 1976-77.(Final Report). Ithaca, N. Y.: Community Service Laboratory, New York State College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, 1977.

Mr. Lazar was contacted by our staff and additional information was solicited.

XVIII. Levy, R. J., & Fulton, J. A. Consequences of divorce for children (OCD-90-C-253)

Only a proposal was contained in the packet forwarded by ACYF. Our attempts to reach Mr. Levy have been unsuccessful.

XIX. Love, J. M. National Home Start

1. Love, J. M., Nauta, M. J., Coelen, C. G., Hewett, K., & Ruopp, R. R. Home Start evaluation study. Cambridge: Abt Associates Inc., 1976.

XX. McAdoo, H. The impact of extended family variables upon upward mobility of black families (OCD-90-C-631)

1. McAdoo, H., Ross-Sheriff, R., Newby, B., Teresa, J., McAdoo, J., & Karsk, R. The impact of extended family variables upon upward mobility of black families (Continuation 1). Columbia, Md.: CoRal, II (Community Research and Action Laboratory), 1975-77.
2. McAdoo, H. The impact of family structured variables upon the social mobility of black families (Continuation Report). Columbia, Md.: CoRal, II (Community Research and Action Laboratory), n.d.

   No body of analyzable data exists in the continuation report. Our staff contacted Ms. McAdoo in January 1978 and asked for results of data analyses, but no materials have arrived.

XXI. McClintock, S. A multi-facet study of Mexian-American mothers and children in a pre-school program. (OCD-90-C-620)

1. McClintock, S., Boulette, T. R., Sonquist, H., Cardenas, E., & Miyade, F. A multi-facet study of Mexican-American mothers and children in a pre-school program (First Year Progress Report). Santa Barbara, Calif.: Santa Barbara Family Care Center, 1976.
2. McClintock, S., Boulette, R. T., Sonquist, H., Cardenas, E., & Miyade, F. A multi-facet study of Mexican-American mothers and children in a pre-school program (Second Year Progress Report). Santa Barbara, Calif.: Santa Barbara Family Care Center, 1976.

   Ms. McClintock was contacted for more information and results from her project. Interim results and staff working papers were forwarded to us and included in the review.

XXII. Mathis, A. Ecological influences of psychosocial development of black children (OCD-90-C-259)

1. Mathis, A. L., Oyemade, U. J., & Chatman, V. S. Ecological influences of psychosocial development of black children (Interim Report). Nashville: Community Mental Health Center, Division of Hospital and Health Services, Meharry Medical College, 1977.

   Mr. Mathis was contacted by our staff for further results of the study. The project was in the final analysis stages and no other reports were available.

XXIII. Nobles, W. W. Changing child rearing orientations and black child development (OCD-90-C-901)

1. Nobles, W. W. Changing child rearing orientations and black child development (Interim Report). San Francisco: Westside Community Mental Health Center, Inc., 1977.

XXIV. Padilla, A. M. *Socialization processes among Mexican-Americans: A sociolinguistic analysis* (OCD-90-C-905)

1. Padilla, A. M. *Socialization processes among Mexican-Americans: A sociolinguistic analysis* (Supplement to Proposal). Los Angeles, University of California, 1976.
2. Padilla, A. M. *Socialization processes among Mexican-Americans: A sociolinguistic analysis* (First Year Progress Report). Los Angeles: University of California, 1977.

XXV. *Parent Child Development Centers*

Briggs, J. Birmingham Center (OCD-90-C-380)

1. Lasater, T. M., Malone, P., Ferguson, C. J., & Weisbergh, P. *Birmingham Center*. Birmingham: Jefferson County Commission for Economic Opportunity, n.d.

Johnson, D. Houston Center (OCD-90-C-379)

2. Johnson, D. L., Kahn, A. J., & Lelar, H. *Houston Center*. Houston: Houston County Community Action Association, n.d.

Weiner, G. New Orleans Center (OCD-90-C-381)

3. Blumenthal, J. B., Andrews, S. R., & Weiner, G. *New Orleans Center*. New Orleans: University of New Orleans, Department of Psychology, n.d.

XXVI. Parke, R. D. *Father-infant interaction: Assessment and modification* (OCD-90-C-900)

1. Parke, R. D. Father-infant interaction: Assessment and modification (Continuation 7/30/76-6/29/78). Champaign: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, n.d.

   Mr. Parke was contacted and promised to send us several papers and to call if any startling analysis results came in. One paper was received but unfortunately it contained no data analysis.

XXVII. Quigley, P. A. *The Choctaw home centered family education demonstration project* (OCD-CB-158)

1. Quigley, P. A. *The Choctaw home centered family education demonstration project* (Final Report). Philadelphia, Miss.: Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, 1976.

XXVIII. Rosenstein, I. *Institutional models for delivery of educational services* (OCD-90-C-903)

1. Frank, M., Rosenstein, I., Morrison, B., Anschuetz, G., Romm, J., Schier, K., & Lovell, D. *Institutional models for delivery of education services*. New York: American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1977.

   Our staff contacted Ms. Gertrude Anschuetz, who is presently working as an investigator on this project. She reported that the project was nearing completion but that the final report with data analysis and conclusions would probably not be available in time for our review.

XXIX. Rosser, P. Study of family style and interactions with external institutions (OCD-90-C-258)

1. Rosser, P., Saslow, H., & Oyemade, U. J. Study of family style and interactions with external institutions. Washington, D.C.: Child Development Center, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, College of Medicine, Howard University, 1977.

XXX. Ryan, S. Children's understanding of socio-moral rules through family interaction (OCD-90-C-902)

1. Ryan, S., & Volpe, J. Children's understanding of socio-moral rules through family interaction. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1977.

   Ms. Ryan was called several times. She reported that the study was not far enough along to send anything. She said she thought there might be some pilot analyses and if so she would send these, but nothing was received in time for the report.

XXXI. Savage, J. An investigation of the impact of parent imprisonment on the socialization of black children (OCD-CB-475)

1. Adair, A. V., Roberts, A., & Savage, J. An empirical investigation of the impact of parent-imprisonment on the socialization of black children (Annual Report #2 and Progress Report #2). Washington, D.C.: Howard University, 1977.

   Data contained in the second annual report were of insufficient quantity to draw conclusions by our staff. We contacted Mr. Savage in January and requested additional data, but no materials have arrived.

XXXII. Schaefer, E. S. Parent-professional-child interaction and involvement (OCD-90-C-246)

1. Schaefer, E. S. Parent-professional-child interaction and involvement (Year Three Continuation Report). Chapel Hill: School of Public Health, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, 1977.

   Second-year data are to be found in the continuation report. Our staff contacted Ms. Maronna Edgerton about data for the final year. She forwarded on to us a summary of the project and a summary of the initial analyses and conclusions from the third year data.

XXXIII. Segal, M. M., & Simco, E. R. Home start: School for parents (OCD-CB-138)

1. Segal, M. M., & Simco, E. R. Home Start: School for parents (Final Report). Ft. Lauderdale: Nova University, 1976.

XXXIV. Silcott, T. G. Study of socio-economic status and racism in a preschool program (OCD-CB-449)

1. Jones, J. A., Taitt, A. L., Washington, K., & Silcott, T. G. Learning and self-esteem among black and white pre-schoolers (Continuation 1 & 2, 7/1/72-12/31/75). Mount Kisco, N. Y.: Black Analysis, Inc., n.d.
2. Jones, J. A., Taitt, A. L., Washington, K., & Silcott, T. G. Learning and self-esteem among black and white pre-schoolers. Mount Kisco, N. Y.: Black Analysis, Inc., 1976.

XXXV. Sussman, M., & Fleming, E. Family-school linkages and socialization (OCD-90-C-632)

1. Sussman, M., & Fleming, E. Family school linkages and socialization (Progress Report). Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, n.d.
2. Sussman, M., & Fleming, E. Family school linkages and socialization. (Progress Report). Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University, 1976.
3. Sussman, M., & Fleming, E. Family-school socialization (Pilot Year Report). Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1975.
4. Fleming, E., & Sussman, M. Family-school linkages and socialization (Pilot Year Report). Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1975.

   We contacted Ms. Fleming regarding later findings. She reported that none was available for the project per se, but several doctoral dissertations have come from the project.

XXXVI. Toledo, R. Health education research and demonstration projects (OCD-90-C-907)

1. Toledo, R., Fernandez, D., Phillips, G., Anderson, B., & Hughes, H. Health education research and demonstration project (Progress Report). Corpus Christi: Driscoll Foundation Children's Hospital, 1977.

   Mr. Toledo has forwarded on to us, at our request, findings from the second and third years of his study. However, this material arrived too late to be included in the body of our report.

APPENDIX B

Selected Reports from the Educational Testing Service Longitudinal Study on Head Start

Shipman, V. C. Educational Testing Service head start longitudinal study

1. Bridgeman, B., & Shipman, V. C. Predictive value of measures of self-esteem and achievement motivation in four to nine year old low-income children (Progress Report 75-24). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.
2. Emmerich, W. Structure and development of personal-social behaviors in preschool settings (Progress Report 71-20). Princeton, J. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.
3. Emmerich, W. Preschool teachers: Beliefs on effective teaching techniques and their relationships to pupil characteristics. (Progress Report 73-12). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
4. Emmerich, W. Preschool personal-social behaviors: Relationships with socioeconomic status, cognitive skills, and tempo (Progress Report 73-33). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Services, 1973.
5. Lindstrom, D. R., & Shipman, V. C. Characteristics of urban preschool centers: Analysis of the preschool inventory (Progress Report 73-21). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
6. Meissner, J. A., Swinton, S. S., Shipman, V. C., Webb, P. A., & Simoskc, S. A. Preschool teachers of disadvantaged children: Characteristics and attitudes (Progress Report 73-46). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.
7. Shipman, V. C. From theory to operations (Progress Report 69-12). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
8. Shipman, V. C. Preliminary description of the initial sample prior to school enrollment. Vol. 1 (Progress Report 70-20). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.
9. Shipman, V. C. Structure and development of cognitive

compentencies and styles prior to school entry (Progress Report 71-19). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

10. Shipman, V. C. *Demographic indexes of socioeconomic status and maternal behaviors and attitudes* (Progress Report 72-12). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

11. Shipman, V. C. *Structural stability and change in the test performance of urban preschool children*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

12. Shipman, V. C. *Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences* (Progress Report 72-27). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

13. Shipman, V. C. *Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences. ETS-Head Start longitudinal study* (Interim Report 73-35). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

14. Shipman, V. C., McKee, J.D., Bridgeman, B., et al. *Stability and change in family status, situational and process variables and their relationship to children's cognitive performance*. (Progress Report 75-28). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

15. Shipman, V.C., Boroson, M., Bridgeman, B., et al. *Notable early characteristics of high and low achieving black low-SES children* (Progress Report 76-21). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

16. Shipman, V. C., McKee, D., & Bridgeman, B. *Stability and change in family status, situational and process variables, and their relationship to children*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

17. Ward, W. C. *Development of self-regulatory behaviors* (Progress Report 73-18). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

18. Ward, W. C. *Correlates and implications of self-regulatory behaviors* (Progress Report 73-42). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

APPENDIX C

Panel of Experts and Nominated Studies

Experts

Joan Aldous, PhD, University of Notre Dame
Barbara Anderson PhD, Washington University, St. Louis Children's hospital
Urie Bronfenbrenner, PhD, Cornell University
John Dill, PhD, City University of New York
Greta Fein, PhD, Merrill-Palmer Institute
Reuben Hill, PhD, University of Minnesota
Jerome Kagan, PhD, Harvard University
Evelyn Moore, PhD., Black Child Development Institute

Three Nominations

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 1971, *4*, (No. 4, Part 2).

Elder, G. *Children of the great depression: Social change in life experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. *Birth to maturity: A study in psychological development*. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Two Nominations

Bell, R. Q. A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychological Review*, 1968, *75*, 81-95.

Bowlby, J. *Attachment and loss. Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Bowlby, J. *Attachment and loss. Vol. 2. Separation*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Kohn, M. L. *Class and conformity*. Georgetown, Ontario: Dorsey, 1969.

Miller, D. R., & Swanson, G. E. *The changing American parent: A study in the Detroit area*. New York: Wiley, 1958.

One Nomination

Aries, P. *Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life*. New York: Knopf, 1965. Translated by Robert Baldick, from *L'enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien regime*. Paris, 1960.

Barker, R. G., & Wright, H. J. *Midwest and its children*. New York: Harper, 1955.

Barry, H., III, Child, I., & Bacon, M. Relation of child training to subsistence economy. *American Anthropologist*, 1959, *61*, 51-63.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1967, *75*, 43-88.

Billingsley, A. *Black families in white America*. Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Block, J. *Lives through time*. Berkeley, Calif.: Bancroft, 1971.

Brazolton, T. B., Koslowski, B., & Main, M. The origins of reciprocity: The early mother-infant interaction. In M. Lewis & L. A. Rosenblum (Eds.), *The effect of the infant on its caregiver*. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Brazelton, T. B. *Neonatal behavioral assessment scale*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1973.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Reality and research in the ecology of human development. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1975, *119*, 439-469.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 1977, *32*, 513-531.

Clarke-Stewart, A. Interactions between mothers and their young children: Characteristics and experiences. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1973 (Serial No. 153).

Coopersmith, S. *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.

Gutman, H. *The black family in slavery and freedom*. New York: Pantheon, 1976.

Hartup, W. W. Peer interaction and the behavioral development of the individual child. In E. Schopler & R. J. Reichler (Eds.), *Psychopathology and child development: Research and treatment*. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.

Hill, R. *Strengths of black families*. Washington, D.C.: National Urban League, 1971.

Hill, R. *Informal adoption in the black community*. Washington, D.C.: National Urban League, 1971.

Hill, R. Family development in three generations. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1970.

Hunt, D. Parents and children in history: The psychology of family life in early modern France. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Kennell, J. H., Trause, M. A., & Klaus, M. H. Evidence for a sensitive period in the human mother. Combined with Klaus, M. H., Trauser, M., & Kennell, J. H. Does human maternal behavior after delivery show a characteristic pattern. (Both in Parent-Infant Interaction, CIBA Foundation, Symposium 33, 1973.)

Kessen, W., & Fein, G. Variations in home-based infant education: Language, play and social development (Final report to the Office of Child Development). Hartford: Child and Family Services, Inc., August 1975.

Lamb, M. E. Father-infant and mother-infant interaction in the first year of life. Child Development, 1977, 48, 167-181.

Lamb, M. Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. Human Development, 1975, 18, 245-266.

Lennard, H. L., & Bernstein, A. Patterns of human interaction. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Lewis, M., & Freedle, R. Mother-infant dyad: The cradle of meaning. In P. Pliner, L. Krames, & T. Alloway (Eds.), Communication and affect: Language and thought. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Lewis, M., & Rosenbloom, L. Friendship and peer relations. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Litwak, E., & Szelenyi, I. Primary group structures and their functions: Kin, neighbors, and friends. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 465-481.

Minturn, L., & Lambert, W. W. Mothers of six cultures: Antecedents of child rearing. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Mishler, E. G., & Waxler, N. E. Interaction in families. An experimental study of family interaction and schizophrenia. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Nash, J. The father in contemporary culture and current psychological literature. Child Development, 1965, 36, 161-207.

Nobles, W. W. A formulative and empirical study of black families

(Final Report submitted to the Office of Child Development). San Francisco: Westwide Community Mental Health Center, Inc., December 1976.

Patterson, G. R., & Cobb, J. A. A dyadic analysis of aggressive behaviors. In J. P. Hill (Ed.), *Minnesota symposia on child psychology* (Vol. 5). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971.

Pearlin, L. I. *Class context and family relations*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.

Radin, N. Father-child interaction and the intellectual functioning of four year old boys. *Developmental Psychology*, 1972, *6*, 353-361.

Reiss, D. M. Varieties of consensual experience: Contrast between families of normals, delinquents, and schizophrenics. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 1952, 73-75.

Rheingold, H. L., & Eckerman, C. O. The infant's free entry into a new environment. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 1969, *8*, 271-283.

Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self image*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rubin, L. B. *Worlds of pain: Life in the working-class family*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Sameroff, A. J., & Chandler, M. J. Reproductive risk and the continuum of caretaking casualty. In F. D. Horowitz (Ed.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. 4). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Sears, R. R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. *Identification and child rearing*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. *Patterns of child rearing*. Evanston, Ill.: Row-Peterson, 1957.

Skeels, H. M. Adult status of children from contrasting early life experiences. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child* Development, 1966, 31(3, Serial No. 112).

Smith, M. B. School and home: Focus on achievement. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), *Developing programs for the educationally disadvantaged*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

Stern, D. *The first relationship*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Thomas, D. L., Gecas, V., Weigert, A., & Rooney, E. Family, socialization and the adolescent: Determinants of self-concept, conformity, religiosity, and counterculture values. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1974.

Whiting, B. B., & Whiting, J. W. M. Children of six cultures: A psychocultural analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Yarrow, M. R., Campbell, J. D., & Burton, R. V. Child rearing: An inquiry into research and methods. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Yarrow, L., Rubenstein, J., & Pedersen, F. Infant and environment: Early cognitive and motor development. New York: Wiley, 1975.

APPENDIX D

Description of Review Manual

1. Our file number
2. Funding number(s) = agency contract number(s)
3. Author(s)
4. Title of report(s)
5. Project title
6. Administrative agency (list all levels)
7. Funding agency
8. Time line of this project: beginning date, proposed duration, phases or milestones
9. Where is this report in the time line? (include date)
10. Supplementary documents needed for complete review. (Check those used in this review; cite only those which can be completely referenced; if additional documents are necessary which are not available for review, request them by name through secretary.)
11. Abstract (about 300 words) (Include purposes and aims; sample characteristics; methodological adequacy, which would include characterizations such as project developed, commercialization, etc.; summary of findings; judgment about study.) (Use lined sheet.)
12. Classification (based on author's stated intent)
    a. Intent of project
        1. Research
        2. Demonstration
    b. Summarize major hypotheses and/or objectives
        1. This report
        2. Total project
    c. Focus as reflected in data (this report) (Check all that apply, circle primary)
        1. Child
        2. Child/family
        3. Family/institution
        4. Institution

12. Classification (continued)

- d. Focus as reflected in data (total project) (Check all that apply; circle primary.)
  - 1. Child
  - 2. Family/child
  - 3. Family/institution
  - 4 institution
- e. Type of report
  - 1. Empirical
  - 2. Theoretical issues
  - 3. Other
- f. Rate adequacy of testing hypotheses and/or meeting objectives (U = unable to code)
  - 1. Inadequate
  - 2. Marginal
  - 3. Adequate
  - 4. Good
  - 5. Excellent

13. External validity

- a. Author's theoretical stance (Check all that apply; circle major stance)
  - 1. Biogenic—cause or relationship genetic or implies malfunctioning physical characteristics (i.e., dyslexia, a visual problem, a biogenic theory of school achievement)
  - 2. Psychogenic—focus on person and some psychological construct
  - 3. Sociogenic—focus on groups or positions in the social structure
  - 4. Interaction—implies that types of persons act or behave in a given way only if placed in certain social positions or situations
  - 5. Atheoretical or inadequate information to judge
- b. Number of studies being reported
  - 1. Which one is this? (Use language of author.) If more than one, items c through k should be completed separately for each.
- c. Setting
  - 1. Describe specific setting in which data is gathered.
  - 2. Ecological setting (Include urban, suburban, rural, and other relevant descriptors.)
- d. Sample selection

  Purposefully selected: List all criteria used in the selection.
  Naturally occurring: What group is being studied? (sampling universe: To what population can the results be generalized?)
  Exceptions: List any exceptions.
- e. Sample size and type

13. External validity (continued)
        1. Experimental
        2. control
        3. Non experimental study group
        4. Not reported
    f. Family structure, status, composition, functioning (Check all that apply; circle major ones that apply.)
        1. Structure (actual, not legal units)
            a. Two-parent nuclear family
            b. Single-parent nuclear family (attenuated)
            c. Extended family (related by blood or marriage)
            d. Augmented family (nuclear or extended plus unrelated members)
            e. The commune
            f. Families with adoptive or foster children
            g. Blended family (parts of two previous families merged into a new unit)
            h. Separated family (unit has enforced separation)
            i. Other
            j. Not reported
        2. Status
            a. Widowed
            b. Divorced
            c. Unmarried
            d. Married
            e. Not reported
        3. Functioning
            a. Working mother
            b. Child rearing practices
            c. Intrafamily relationships (and family dynamics)
            d. Parental roles and behavior
            e. Parental attitudes and/or expectations
            f. Sibling relationships
            g. Parent-child relationships
            h. Parent-institution interactions
            i. Other
            j. Not reported
    g. Sex
        1. Males
        2. Females
        3. Both
        4. Not reported
    h. Age range or mean at time of data collection (best available measures of dispersion and central tendency)
        1. Children
        2. Parent(s)
        3. Not reported
    i. Education range or mean at time of data collection. (best available measures of dispersion and central tendency)

13. External validity (continued)
    j. Family income range or mean at time of data collection. (Best available measures of dispersion and central tendency); or SES: lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle, upper.
    k. Race/ethnic background (proportions, if given)
        1. Caucasian
        2. Mexican-American
        3. Negro
        4. Oriental
        5. American Indian
        6. Other
        7. Not reported

14. Internal validity
    a. Design sophistication
        1. Historical
        2. Case study (qualitative not quantitative report)
        3. Descriptive (no relationship between variables explored)
        4. Correlational (relationships between variables explored)
        5. Quasi-experimental (see Campbell and Stanley)
        6. Unobtrusive-measure experiment
        7. Experimental
        8. None of the above
    b. Operational definitions
        1. Rater's judgment as to constructs being measured in study and general categories of constructs
        2. Measures as related to constructs
    c. Was a variable manipulated, intervention or treatment imposed? (yes or no; if no, ignore T scale)
    d. Were multiple measures of the same dimension(s) used? (yes or no)
    e. Rate follow-up, measurement fidelity, and analysis for each variable
        1. Follow-up of intervention study (1 = Yes, 2 = No, U = not reported)
        2. Measurement fidelity (validity, reliability, objectivity) (In combining these, rate for the lowest component; note type of reliability and validity used, if possible.)

            M1 = information available that the instrument is invalid for this use

            M2 = project developed instrument with low V,R,O or no information about a commercially produced or other project-developed instrument

            M3 = Commercially produced or other project-developed instrument with low V,R,O for this application

            M4 = Project developed or other-project developed instrument with moderate V,R,O for this application

            M5 = Commercially produced instrument with moderate V,R,O

14. Internal validity (continued)
    M6 = Commercially produced instrument with high V,R,O for this application
    U = Unable to code
  3. Analysis (from Gephart) (Rate each statistical analysis performed separately.)
    A = Appropriately analyzed
    I = Inappropriately analyzed
    M = Missing elements (from analysis)
    U = Cannot tell

15. Design profile (from Gephart) (Number hypotheses from page 2 of Review Form.)
  a. 1 = Logic (Rate each hypothesis separately.)
    Q = empirical question
    Hs = illogical relationship
    Hnc = no conclusion
    Hq = hypothesis questionable
    Hc = hypothesis credible
    Hv = hypothesis verified
  b. 2 = Representativeness (from Gephart) (Choose only one code for lowest rated component.)
    R1 = unidentified
    R2 = volunteers
    R3 = purposive sampling from specified population
    R4 = random selection from specified population
    R5 = entire population
  c. 3 = Treatment (theory = outcomes, findings) (Rate the amount of description first; if not completed, then it must be a 1 or 2 no matter how much theory; choose only one.)
    T1 = no theory; something undenfined happened
    T2 = no theory; treatmnet not thoroughly described but the main features
    T3 = no theory; treatment described in detail in the report
    T4 = theory stated but no controls on variables
    T5 = theory stated and mediating variables controlled
    T6 = theory stated, mediating variables controlled, and techniques used to distribute possible extraneous variables

16. Author's statement regarding strengths and weaknesses of study/program (Paraphrase, xerox, or summarize, as needed.)

17. Theoretical and research issues and recommendations that author(s) indicate important or significant or generalizable for further research and/or programs. (Code for Implicit and Explicit.)
  a. Focused on:
    1. Individual (i.e., certain experiences and/or training)
    2. Family

17. Theoretical and research issues and recommendations . . . (Cont'd.)
        - a. Structure
        - b. Relationships
        - c. Child rearing practices
    3. Institutions
        - a. Structure or programs
        - b. Relationships (i.e., coordinated services)
        - c. Practices
    4. Society
        - a. Economic policies
        - b. Social patterns
        - c. Federal, state or local status
        - d. Federal state or local agency policies
    5. Physical environment
        - a. Geographical location
        - b. Housing conditions
        - c. Facilities and equipment for children
        - d. Mass media
        - e. Social crises (e.g., noise, crime, unemployment)

18. Author's practical and program issues and recommendations (Code for Implicit and Explicit.)
    - a. Focused on:
        1. Individual (i.e., certain experiences and/or training)
        2. Family
            - a. Structure
            - b. Relationships
            - c. Child rearing practices
        3. Institutions
            - a. Structure or programs
            - b. Relationships (i.e., coordinated services)
            - c. Practices
        4. Society
            - a. Economic policies
            - b. Social patterns
            - c. Federal, state or local status
            - d. Federal, state or local agency policies
        5. Physical environment
            - a. Geographical location
            - b. Housing conditions
            - c. Facilities and equipment for children
            - d. Mass media
            - e. Social crises (e.g., noise, crime, unemployment)

19. Reviewer's judgment of strengths and/or weaknesses of study/project (Were original hypotheses tested? What hypotheses were tested?)

20. Theoretical and research issues and recommendations reviewers indicate important or significant or generalizable for further research

20. (Continued) and/or programs. (What we saw that they didn't.)
    a. Focused on:
        1. Individual (i.e., certain experiences and/or training)
        2. Family
            a. Structure
            b. Relationships
            c. Child rearing practices
        3. Institutions
            a. Structure or programs
            b. Relationships (i.e., coordinated services)
            c. Practices
        4. Society
            a. Economic policies
            b. Social patterns
            c. Federal, state or local status
            d. Federal, state or local agency policies
        5. Physical environment
            a. Geographical location
            b. Housing conditions
            c. Facilities and equipment for children
            d. Mass media
            e. Social crises (e.g., noise, crime, unemployment)

21. Reviewer's practical and program issues and recommendations
    a. Focused on:
        1. Individual (i.e., certain experiences and/or training)
        2. Family
            a. Structure
            b. Relationships
            c. Child rearing practices
        3. Institutions
            a. Structure or programs
            b. Relationships (i.e., coordinated services)
            c. Practices
        4. Society
            a. Economic policies
            b. Social patterns
            c. Federal, state
            d. Federal, state or local agency policies
        5. Physical environment
            a. Geographical location
            b. Housing conditions
            c. Facilities and equipment for children
            d. Mass media
            e. Social crises (e.g., noise, crime, unemployment)

22. Policy and program implications of study as seen by reviewer
    a. Focused on:
        1. Individual (i.e., certain experiences and/or training)
        2. Family

22. Policy and program implications of study . . . (Continued)
        - a. Structure
        - b. Relationships
        - c. Child rearing practices
    - 3. Institutions
        - a. Structure or programs
        - b. Relationships (i.e., coordinated services)
        - c. Practices
    - 4. Society
        - a. Economic policies
        - b. Social patterns
        - c. Federal, state or local status
        - d. Federal, state or local agency policies
    - 5. Physical environment
        - a. Geographical location
        - b. Housing conditions
        - c. Facilities and equipment for children
        - d. Mass media
        - e. Social crises (e.g., noise, crime, unemployment)